Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/behindthirdgospe0000unse

Behind the THIRD GOSPEL

Oxford University Press
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the University

Behind the THIRD GOSPEL

A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis

by

VINCENT TAYLOR, B.D., PH.D. (LOND.)
Author of *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Sem
BS
2595
.T3
1926
42,4
EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
5243

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1926

Printed in England
At the OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
By John Johnson
Printer to the University

VANGELI...
SCHOOL OF TH...
5243

INTRODUCTION

THE present work represents an attempt to get behind the Third Gospel to an earlier stage in its composition along the lines of Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke Hypothesis. When this attractive theory was first presented in the *Hibbert Journal* for October 1921, it seemed to me of such far-reaching importance that a detailed investigation of its claims was imperative. Such an investigation I have endeavoured to make during the last three and a half years. The result of this has been to deepen the conviction that the Proto-Luke Theory has come to stay, and to accumulate materials which, unless I am mistaken, go a long way towards providing what was originally put forward as a scientific hypothesis only with substantial verification.

While necessarily recapitulating many of Canon Streeter's arguments, I have tried to state them independently, in the order in which they naturally present themselves to any one who begins with the foundations, and in some points of minor importance I have found reason to suggest certain modifications of his conclusions. I have further been able to add a number of new points and fresh considerations, and also, by verbal statistics and closer analysis of the literary phenomena, to increase the weight of the arguments on which he relied. To try to set the hypothesis in its true place in the evolution of Synoptic Criticism seemed also to be desirable, and this I have attempted in the opening chapter, with the result, I hope, that the theory is seen to be a culminating point to quite a number of previous lines of inquiry which at first sight seem very diverse in character. In

addition, I have sought to work out the historical value and theological importance of Proto-Luke, for these matters do not merely follow as the consequences of the theory, but react upon the various arguments, linguistic and literary, by which it is supported. In pursuit of these aims I have considered the importance of the points in which Mark and Proto-Luke agree and the significance of those in which they are, or appear to be, at variance. I have also examined the agreements and divergences between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel in their bearing on the historical value of the latter, and have considered afresh the value of the material which is peculiar to the Third Gospel.

The book was nearly ready for publication when Canon Streeter's important work, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, was published in the autumn of 1924. A valuable chapter in this book carries the Proto-Luke Hypothesis a stage farther, but not much farther, than its original statement in the *Hibbert* article, the principal difference being that in *The Four Gospels* the theory is brought into close connexion with the new Four Document Hypothesis. Room, therefore, was still left, indeed there seemed a demand, for a more exhaustive examination of the theory of the existence of an early non-Markan source as the foundation and framework of St. Luke's Gospel. In connexion with the final stages of this task I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Canon Streeter, who has been kind enough to read the greater part of the typescript and to furnish me with a number of valuable criticisms and suggestions.

Partly in consequence of the fact that I began with the earlier statement of the theory, my account of the origin and nature of Proto-Luke stands nearer than does that of Canon Streeter to the commonly accepted Two Document Theory. I am not inclined to regret this, for it is important to insist that the Proto-Luke Theory is not really dependent upon any views we form of Q or other early documents such as M and L. There is an advantage in assuming, as a basis of inquiry, orthodox views concerning Mark and Q. If, in this way, we can demon-

strate the existence of Proto-Luke, we can then turn back to our initial assumptions, and see if we require such documents as M and L, parallel to Q, in order to explain the variations of Matthew and Luke in their versions of the sayings of Jesus. This question belongs to the wider issues of the Synoptic Problem; it is not vitally bound up with the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Even if Q were a purely oral source, a view which is most improbable, it would still be possible to deduce the existence of Proto-Luke from the disposition of Markan and non-Markan matter within the Third Gospel.

While seeking to make the investigation as complete as possible, I have tried to keep in mind the needs of the general reader who is interested in questions of Gospel Origins. My work naturally rests upon the detailed study of the Greek text, but I have quoted the original text only when necessary with the result, I believe, that the book will be easy to read to any one who is not familiar with New Testament Greek. I have endeavoured to state the argument in such a way that any one who realizes the immense importance of a theory which claims the existence of a Gospel writing slightly earlier than Mark may be able to estimate for himself the worth of the case on which it rests. The theory, I would urge, is scientific, for it deals with facts, linguistic, literary, and historical; it also has a practical value because, if sound, it supplies us with a fresh angle from which to study the life, personality, and teaching of Jesus Christ.

In conclusion, I desire to express my gratitude to Professor W. F. Howard, who was kind enough to examine what I had written on the question of Semitisms in St. Luke's style; to Professor F. B. Clogg, who has again given me invaluable help in the reading of the proof-sheets; and to my wife and the Rev. R. I. Hopwood, M.A., who have also assisted me in this task. In so detailed an argument some errors may have been overlooked, but no pains have been spared to avoid this. The Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel, assumed throughout this book, has been discussed in an article in the *Expositor* for

October last. In the present work the treatment necessarily entails a number of minor points upon which there is room for different opinions, but I hope that in its main outlines the Proto-Luke Hypothesis has been shown to be a positive addition to Synoptic source-criticism, and thus to our knowledge of Christ and His teaching.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

KEIGHLEY,
November, 1925.

524 c

CONTENTS

I

SYNOPTIC SOURCE-CRITICISM IN RELATION TO THE THIRD GOSPEL

PAGE

Introduction 1

§ 1. *Survey of Recent Synoptic Source-Criticism in relation to the Third Gospel* 2

(*a*) P. Feine 2

(*b*) B. Weiss and J. Weiss 3

(*c*) F. C. Burkitt 4

(*d*) V. H. Stanton 8

(*e*) Sir John C. Hawkins 10

(*f*) J. Vernon Bartlet 12

(*g*) W. Sanday 18

(*h*) A. M. Perry 20

(*i*) B. H. Streeter 22

§ 2. *The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: Methods and Principles of Investigation* 27

II

THE LUKAN PASSION AND RESURRECTION NARRATIVES

Introduction 33

§ 1. *Markan and Non-Markan Elements in the Narratives of Lk. xxii.–xxiv.* 34

1. The Priests' Plot 34

2. The Treachery of Judas 34

3. The Preparations for the Passover 34

PAGE

4. The Last Supper 35

(*a*) The Narrative of Institution 36
(*b*) The Prediction of the Betrayal 40
(*c*) The Discourse on True Greatness, and the Saying about Twelve Thrones 41
(*d*) Christ's words to Simon and the Prediction of the Denial 42
(*e*) The Conversation on the Change of Methods . . 43

5. The Agony in the Garden 43
6. The Betrayal and Arrest 45
7. Peter's Denial 48
8. The Mocking 49
9. The Trial before the Priests 50
10. The Trial before Pilate and Herod 52
11. The Story of Simon of Cyrene and of the Journey to the Cross 54
12. The Crucifixion 55
13. The Burial 59
14. The Subsequent Action of the Women 60
15. The Visit of the Women to the Tomb 63
16. The Appearance on the Way to Emmaus. An Appearance to the Apostles. The Ascension . . . 66

§ 2. *Summary and Conclusions* 67

(*a*) Reasons for speaking of a single Non-Markan Source rather than of various Non-Markan Sources . . 68
(*b*) Is the Non-Markan Source an Oral Source? . . . 69
(*c*) Reasons for regarding the Non-Markan Source as a Document 71
(*d*) Is the Non-Markan Source in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. part of a larger whole? 75

III

ST. LUKE'S USE OF MARK IN LK. I.–XXI. 4

Non-Markan Sections 76

Sections for Discussion 78

(1) Lk. iv. 31–44 78
(2) Lk. v. 12–vi. 19 80

PAGE
(3) Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50 84
(4) Lk. xviii. 15–43 92
(5) Lk. xix. 29–40 94
(6) Lk. xix. 45–8 95
(7) Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 4 98

IV

THE LUKAN ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

Introduction 101

§ 1. *The Prophecy of the Fate of the Temple, and the Warnings regarding False Messiahs, Tumults, Wars, &c.* . . 102

§ 2. *Warnings as regards the Persecutions to which Christ's Followers will be subjected* 104

§ 3. *The Fall of Jerusalem, the Times of the Gentiles, and the Coming of the Son of Man* 109

(1) Four undoubtedly Markan Passages in Lk. xxi. 20–36 considered in their relation to their Lukan context . 110
(2) Unity of the Non-Markan Portions of Lk. xxi. 20–36 . 113
(3) Mk. xiii. as used and neglected by the Third Evangelist 114

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

The Literary Genesis of Lk. xxi. 20–36 118

V

ST. LUKE'S USE OF HIS MARKAN SOURCE

§ 1. *The Markan Sections* 126
List of Markan Passages in the Third Gospel . . . 126
Distribution of the Markan matter 128
The same material as it appears in Mk. 129
Provisional conclusions regarding the manner in which Mk. is used by the Third Evangelist 130

§ 2. *The 'Markan Omissions'* 135
List of Markan Passages omitted in the Third Gospel . . 136
(1) The 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26) . . 138

PAGE

(2) Instances in which St. Luke has used Q and not Mk. 140

(3) Other Markan Passages, mainly Narratives, in respect of which preference has been given to Non-Markan Versions 141

VI

ST. LUKE'S USE OF Q

Introduction 144

§ 1. *An Examination of the Manner in which Q has been used by the Third Evangelist* 145

(A) Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 145

(B) Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3 149

(C) Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 151

(D) Lk. xix. 1–28 159

§ 2. *Inferences arising from St. Luke's use of Q* 161

VII

PROVISIONAL GROUNDS FOR AFFIRMING THE CONTINUITY OF A MAIN NON-MARKAN SOURCE

§ 1. Non-Markan Sections in Lk. which appear to stand apart from everything else in the Gospel 164

(1) The Birth and Infancy Narratives 164

(2) The Preface 166

(3) The Non-Markan Sections in the Eschatological Discourse 166

§ 2. Connecting Links between the remaining Non-Markan Sections previous to the Passion and Resurrection Narrative . 168

§ 3. The Unity of Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30; v. 1–11; vi. 12–viii. 3; ix. 51–xviii. 14; xix. 1–28; xix. 37–44; xix. 47–8 . . 172

§ 4. The Relation of the Passion and Resurrection Narrative to the Non-Markan Sections already discussed . . . 175

§ 5. The 'Gap' between the Passion Narrative and the earlier Non-Markan Sections 177

§ 6. Summary 180

VIII

THE PROTO-LUKE HYPOTHESIS

PAGE

Introduction 182

§ 1. *The Case for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* 183

(1) The Analogy presented by the phenomena of the Passion and Resurrection Narrative 183

(2) The Manner in which Mk. is actually used . . . 184

(3) St. Luke's Use of Q 184

(4) The Probability of the Existence of a continuous Non-Markan Source, and the Relation of the Markan Sections thereto 185

(5) The 'Markan Omissions' in their bearing on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis 188

(6) Phenomena within the Third Gospel which are explained on the Proto-Luke Theory 193

(7) The Agreement of the Theory with all that we know of St. Luke's Methods, and in particular with his use of the 'We-Sections' in the Acts 198

§ 2. *The Authorship of Proto-Luke* 202

§ 3. *The Date and Place of Composition* 211

Note on the Text of Proto-Luke 214

IX

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF PROTO-LUKE

Introduction 216

§ 1. Points of Agreement between Proto-Luke and St. Mark's Gospel 218

§ 2. Points of Agreement between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel 221

§ 3. Points of Difference between Proto-Luke and St. Mark's Gospel 230

§ 4. Narratives peculiar to Proto-Luke 246

X

THE THEOLOGY OF PROTO-LUKE

PAGE

§ 1. *The Teaching of Jesus* 255

The Kingdom of God—The Parousia—The Lukan Parables — Riches — Grace — Forgiveness — God — Prayer — Faith.

§ 2. *The Portrait of Jesus* 260

The Impression made upon His Contemporaries—His Graciousness and Severity—His Sense of Purpose—The Realism of Proto-Luke—The Humanity of Christ—The Unity of the Portrait.

§ 3. *Christology* 265

Names and Titles—Old Testament Prophecy—The Spirit in relation to Jesus—The Sonship of Jesus—Comparison with other parts of the Lukan Writings—The Writer's Purpose.

§ 4. *The Theological Value of Proto-Luke* 273

Its Relation to the Theology of the Fourth Evangelist and to that of St. Paul—Its Intrinsic Merits.

INDEX 275

ABBREVIATIONS

A.J.T.	*The American Journal of Theology.*
D.C.G.	*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, J. Hastings (1906–8).
E.B.	*Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1899–1903).
E.T.	*The Expository Times.*
G.H.D.	*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, V. H. Stanton (Parts I–III, 1903–20).
G.H.T.	*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, F. C. Burkitt (1906).
Gk. Gr.	*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, J. H. Moulton (vols. i and ii, 1908–19).
H.D.B.	*Dictionary of the Bible*, J. Hastings (1898–1904).
H.J.	*The Hibbert Journal.*
H.S.	*Horae Synopticae*, Sir John C. Hawkins (2nd ed., 1909).
I.C.C.	*The International Critical Commentary.*
I.N.T.	*An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, J. Moffatt (3rd ed., 1918).
J.B.L.	*The Journal of Biblical Literature.*
J.T.S.	*The Journal of Theological Studies.*
O.S.S.	*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, W. Sanday and others (1911).
Proleg.	Vol. I of Moulton's *Grammar* (3rd ed., 1908).
V.G.T.	*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, Moulton and Milligan (Parts I–V, 1914–25).

NOTE. The abbreviations Mt., Mk., Lk., Jn. are always meant to refer to the Gospels, not to their authors. The source containing the Sayings of Jesus, used in Mt. and in Lk. (Q), is occasionally described as the Logian Document.

5243

I

SYNOPTIC SOURCE-CRITICISM IN RELATION TO THE THIRD GOSPEL

WITH but few dissentients, it is now widely recognized that the sources lying behind the Synoptic Gospels are documentary, and there is all but universal agreement that Mk., or what is substantially Mk., has been used by the two later Evangelists. Even as regards the 'hypothetical document Q' there is a solid weight of critical opinion in favour of the theory presented for English readers in the essays of Sir John C. Hawkins and Canon B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Certain questions, however, still remain open. Is the order of Q best reflected in Mt. or in Lk.?[1] Did St. Mark make use of Q?[2] Did Q contain any account of the Passion, and is it in any sense a Gospel?[3] Can its contents be ascertained and its language recovered?[4] Did St. Matthew and St. Luke use the same recension of Q,[5] and why is our knowledge of the document restricted to inferences from internal evidence and speculations regarding the enigmatic words of the Papias tradition? It is probable, however, that the clash of opinion is less serious than it might at first sight appear to be. Evidence will hereafter be submitted which points to a distinct movement in a common direction, all the more remarkable because but partially conscious

[1] Harnack prefers the order of Mt. (*Sayings*). Cf. also Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 195, and W. C. Allen, *O.S.S.*, pp. 235 ff. Most English scholars prefer St. Luke's order. Cf. Streeter, *O.S.S.*, pp. 141 ff.

[2] Cf. Streeter, *O.S.S.*, pp. 165 ff., and, on the other side, Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, pp. 204 ff. Streeter now prefers the view that Mk. and Q overlapped (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 186 ff.).

[3] Burkitt has answered the question in the affirmative (*G.H.T.*, pp. 134 ff.). Cf. also Bartlet, *O.S.S.*, pp. 331 ff. Most critics deny that Q contained a Passion narrative.

[4] Cf. Harnack, *Sayings*, and Stanton, *G.H.D.*, ii, p. 76 f..

[5] Cf. Sanday, *O.S.S.*, p. xxii, and Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 195.

of itself. The hill Difficulty is being sapped by workers who hear to their surprise the hammers of other workmen whose plans had seemed so different. Some justification of this hopeful opinion is clearly necessary. It will be found, I think, if we review the course of recent Synoptic Criticism in relation to two questions which cannot be entirely separated—the nature of the Q document, and the special sources which lie behind the Third Gospel.

§ 1. *Survey of recent Synoptic Source-criticism in relation to the Third Gospel.*

From what sources, other than Mk. and Q, did St. Luke obtain the matter which is peculiar to his Gospel? Did the Evangelist collect this tradition from the lips of informants, or had it already taken definite shape in a source whether oral or written? In the latter case we have what may be called a *Three Source Theory*. Substantially, this is the view which has been presented by P. Feine, B. Weiss, Johannes Weiss, and others, though frequently with a tendency, more marked in some writers than in others, to reduce the three to two by the presumption that when used by St. Luke in the composition of the Third Gospel, the 'special' source had already been combined with Q. In his *Life of Christ* (1883), after speaking of St. Luke's use of Mk. and 'the oldest apostolic document', Bernhard Weiss writes: 'The supposition is ever suggesting itself, that besides Mark's Gospel there lay before the Evangelist another comprehensive delineation of the whole life of Jesus, even if his assertions regarding the many men, to whose attempts he already refers, will scarcely permit of all the materials peculiar to himself being allotted to this source. True, we are in no position to ascertain the construction or date of composition of that original source, or of anything else used by him' (vol. i, p. 80). This suggestion, tentatively made, continued to grow until in *Die Quellen der Synoptischen Überlieferung* (1908) Weiss printed in Greek his reconstruction of St. Luke's special source (which he calls L), beginning with the Birth Story and ending with the Passion and Resurrection narratives.

It is, however, to *P. Feine* (*Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung*

des Lukas, 1891) that the first complete statement of a special documentary source, other than Mk. and Q, must be attributed. This source, Jewish-Christian in character, began with Lk. i. 5–ii. 52 and the Genealogy (iii. 23–38), and included the material peculiar to the Third Gospel apart from the Lukan parables.[1] As used by St. Luke, however, this document had already been expanded, the Logian matter common to Mt. and Lk. having been embedded in it (cf. Stanton, *G.H.D.*, ii, p. 222). With this view it is interesting to compare the theories of Wendt and Weizsäcker, instanced by Stanton (*op. cit.*, p. 227), who reach a similar conclusion though beginning at the opposite end. They hold that the Logian document used by St. Luke had already come to contain much of the matter peculiar to Lk. in vi. 20–viii. 3 and ix. 51–xviii. 14, a theory for which there is probably much more to be said than for those immediately under review.

Between the various reconstructions of the supposed special source as given by Feine,[2] B. Weiss, and J. Weiss there is naturally very much in common. Like Feine both *B. Weiss* and *J. Weiss* include the matter peculiar to Lk., but B. Weiss also claims a number of sections where it is more reasonable to think that St. Luke's debt was to Mk.; thus he includes xviii. 31–4 (The Third Prediction of the Passion), parts of xx. and xxii. 1–6 (The Priests' Plot and The Treachery of Judas). Both B. Weiss and J. Weiss ascribe to the special source the Lukan parables, the account of the various questions put to the Baptist, the reference to the Seventy, the story of the woman in the crowd who cried, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee', and many sayings, particularly in ix. 51–xviii. 14, which have no parallels, or only doubtful parallels in Mt.

As against all these reconstructions, however, the objections

[1] Feine's source ran on into the Acts, i.–xii. Cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 286.

[2] Feine's source (*op. cit.*, pp. 13–33) is conveniently summarized by Moffatt (*I.N.T.*, p. 276) as follows: i. 5–ii. 52 (Birth Stories), iii. 23–38 (Genealogy), iv. 14–30 (Rejection at Nazareth), v. 1–11, vii. 1–10, 11–17, 36–50, viii. 1–3, ix. 51–6, x. 38–42, xiii. 10–17, 31–3, xiv. 1–6, xvii. 11–19, xix. 1–10, 39–44, xxi. 37 f., xxii. 14–23, 31–4, 35–8, 39–46, 47–53, 54–62, 63–71, xxiii. 1–56, xxiv. 1–53. The special source as determined by J. Weiss is displayed by Moffatt on p. 277.

are insuperable. (1) It is rightly pointed out by Moffatt (*I.N.T.*, p. 277) that 'the precision with which (the special source) is picked out, and materials assigned to it or to Q, carries very little conviction'. 'The linguistic and inward criteria . . . are too subjective in the large majority of cases' (*ibid.*). (2) In the second place, sections are included in the special source which are more naturally explained as the work of St. Luke himself. 'We shall also find (I believe) that some of the pieces peculiar to the third Gospel, more particularly in the closing portion of the narrative, bear strong marks of having been put into writing by the evangelist himself, not taken from a document' (Stanton, *G.H.D.*, ii, p. 222). (3) Finally, the reconstructed source lacks unity and completeness. The attempt to include the Birth Stories of i. 5–ii. 52 is particularly unconvincing, for this section bears every mark of constituting a separate source, either documentary or oral. For the rest, the special source is a mere string of *membra disjecta*, such as we can never suppose to have existed as a whole, at any rate in writing. Feine's suggestion, that the writer's purpose was to produce a purely supplementary narrative, is unsatisfactory, since, as Stanton remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 223), this motive did not operate in the composition of Mt. and Lk. 'The object of the writers in these cases evidently was to give, so far as they could, a complete narrative.'

Along with this conclusion the further suggestion, that eventually the Logian material came to be fused with the special source, falls also to the ground. But having said this we have not said all. There is no failure in honest Synoptic Criticism. The work of the Three Document theorists means that they enable us to close one avenue along which advance had seemed possible, and, in rejecting their theory, Criticism had still to return to the point of departure. The question still lay open for discussion: *Was Q expanded so as to receive some of the matter peculiar to the Third Gospel, and was such a source, along with Mk., utilized by the Third Evangelist?*

Before we pass on to describe the manner in which this question has been treated by Dr. V. H. Stanton and other English scholars, we must turn aside to consider a very important contribution to Lukan source-criticism made by *Dr. F. C.*

Burkitt in his *Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906). Dr. Burkitt follows a line of his own, and in no way can he be claimed as upholding the theory of a special Lukan source distinct from Mk. and Q. In a sense, his work stands apart from the development we are trying to trace, and yet, as we shall see, it is closely connected with that development. Dr. Burkitt's work is marked by courage and candour; he leaves us in no doubt as to his opinions and is not afraid to dissent from views which are almost universally held. His characteristic theory is the view that Q contained a story of the Passion. This theory has been widely rejected, and rightly, for it is supported by arguments derived from the Third Gospel alone, and leaves entirely unexplained the neglect of the presumed Passion narrative in Q by the First Evangelist. Looking back, however, we can see that the rejection of Burkitt's theory tended to obscure the positive value of many arguments which he used, and which are capable of a different application from the one to which they were put. Thus, Burkitt states a very strong case for the independence and high historical value of the Lukan Passion narrative. It was upon this contention that he built up his argument regarding the contents of Q, and it is the merit of his work that, while the superstructure has collapsed, he firmly laid foundation-stones upon which later reconstructions have been built. We shall find that this is especially the case when we come to review the theories of Bartlet and Streeter. In view of this claim, it is imperative that we should give a somewhat detailed account of Burkitt's theory.

Burkitt points out that, while the Passion narrative in the First Gospel is undoubtedly based upon Mk., the case is very different in Lk. St. Luke 'freely omits large portions of Mark, and in the Passion he deserts Mark to follow another story of the last scenes' (*op. cit.*, p. 130). Burkitt argues that the source in question was Q, which contained an account of the Passion and was, in effect, a 'Gospel'.[1] He lays a good deal of stress on the presence of the saying about 'twelve thrones' in the Lukan Passion narrative (xxii. 30). This passage is parallel to Mt. xix. 28, 'a non-Marcan verse, interpolated after the usual manner of

[1] Cf. also *J.T.S.* (April, 1907), p. 457.

Matthew into the main framework of the Marcan narrative'. Since St. Luke does not, as a rule, disturb the relative order of the sources which he employs, the facts suggest that in Lk. xxii. 30 we have a fragment of Q, and that Q contained a story of the Passion as well as Discourses (cf. p. 135). Other narrative matter occurred in Q (e. g. the story of the Centurion's Servant), and there is nothing therefore surprising that it should have given an account of the last scenes (cf. p. 135).

Burkitt supports his thesis, the speculative character of which he fully realizes,[1] by pointing out the intrinsic merits of St. Luke's Passion narrative. In several respects Mk. and Lk. do not agree as to the time or order in which events occurred, and the superior tradition is that of Lk. These incidents include Peter's Denial, the Trial by the Priests, the rough horse-play to which Jesus was subjected while a prisoner, and the mock adoration of Him as King by the soldiers. Here, Burkitt's argument is best presented in his own words:

> 'The main course of the action is more intelligible in this section as Luke gives it, at least from the point of view of the chief priests. We can hardly suppose that the Jewish grandees kept vigil all night on account of the Galilean Agitator; according to S. Luke they did not do so. Our Lord is arrested in the dead of night, and, as we should expect, He is simply detained in custody until the great folk get up in the morning (Lk. xxii. 66). A prisoner, and deserted by His followers, He is naturally exposed to the vulgar insults of the Temple police who had arrested Him (vv. 63–5); in point of fact, they have nothing else to do. Meanwhile, Peter slinks into a corner of the great court; we are even told that he shewed his face in the light of the fire (v. 56). He denies His Master, as we know, during the hours that slowly pass by. All the action takes place in the court: in one corner is the Prisoner, in another is Peter and the group of servants. I can very well believe that the one group was visible to the other, and that the Lord really did turn and look upon Peter (v. 61). At last the day breaks and the elders of the people gather together, chief priests and scribes; they give their Prisoner a hasty trial (vv. 66–71) and as soon as He is condemned they bring Him at once before Pilate (xxiii. 1 ff.).
>
> 'According to Mark, who is of course followed by Matthew, the chief priests try Jesus in the dead of night, and the rough horse-play and buffeting appears to be done by some members of the Council themselves while they are waiting till it is time to go to Pilate, not by the Temple guards waiting till it is time for the Council

[1] Cf. *G.H.T.*, p. 136.

to assemble. I venture to think that S. Luke's account is the more probable' (*op. cit.*, pp. 136 ff.).

Similarly, Burkitt argues the superiority of St. Luke's account of the mock adoration of Jesus as King by Herod's soldiers, as compared with the story of Mk. xv. 16–20 a, which ascribes this act to the soldiers of the Roman governor. He also points to the 'genuinely Jewish phrase', χριστὸν βασιλέα (= Malka Meshiha, 'King Messiah'), in the accusation which the priests bring against Jesus before Pilate. Turning to the account of the Supper, Burkitt draws attention to the concluding section in the account of the conversation of Jesus with His disciples, and especially to the words about buying swords, since Jesus and His followers will soon be counted among lawless folk: 'They are among the saddest words in the Gospels, and the mournful irony with which they are pervaded seems to me wholly alien from the kind of utterance which a Christian Evangelist would invent for His Master' (p. 140 f.). In addition to the sadness of the words of Jesus, Burkitt speaks of the vein of tender and melancholy playfulness which they reveal, a spirit which is 'totally alien from ignorant fanaticism, and indeed . . . from the general spirit of early Christianity' (p. 142). The presence of this trait in the Gospel record 'is in itself a proof that the Evangelists and the sources from which they drew sometimes remembered better than they understood' (*ibid.*).

From the above account of Burkitt's views, the claim we have made is amply justified. The contention that St. Luke's Passion narrative rests upon an early and valuable source, which is independent of St. Mark's Gospel, has very great force and is the permanent contribution of Burkitt's argument. The opinion that this source is Q is among the things which pass. It is clear, however, that Burkitt's work prepared the way for the question: Might not the Lukan Passion narrative rest upon an expanded version of Q, produced by St. Luke or some one else, which was preferred in Lk. xxii. 14 ff. to the Markan source followed exclusively by the First Evangelist? The conjunction of Burkitt's estimate of the value of the Lukan Passion narrative with his view of the contents of Q undoubtedly delayed the discussion of this question. Thus, it is interesting to note that Dr. Stanton's criticism of Burkitt's theory turns exclusively upon

the question of Q; it ignores the argument regarding the Lukan Passion narrative.[1] Moreover, in discussing the question whether St. Luke used an enlarged version of the Logian document, Stanton's point of departure is the earlier theories of Feine and B. Weiss. We have argued that these theories by their failure raise the question: Was Q expanded so as to receive some of the matter peculiar to the Third Gospel, and was such a source used by St. Luke? It is extremely interesting to find that, in dismissing the views of Feine and Weiss, Stanton answered this question in the affirmative, and it is obviously necessary to give some account of this hypothesis.

The late *Dr. V. H. Stanton* of Cambridge has laid all New Testament scholars under his debt by his judicial discussion of all problems relating to the criticism of the Gospels. His *magnum opus* is *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, and it is in the second part of this great work, published in 1909, that he treats the question of St. Luke's sources.

So far as Lk. i. 5–ii. 52 and the Genealogy (Lk. iii. 23-38) are concerned, Stanton's view is that they are parts of a separate source which reached the Evangelist in a written form (*op. cit.*, pp. 223 ff.). For his account of the Ministry of Jesus St. Luke used, besides Mk., 'one other principal source', an expanded form of the Logian document (Q). 'With a copy of the latter as a foundation, a good deal of other matter was embodied, somewhere in Palestine' (p. 239). The additional matter consisted of (*a*) extracts from the Aramaic Collection of Logia, which had not been fully rendered before; (*b*) many parables which corresponded with Aramaic originals, 'but which had been told orally and in greater or less degree shaped anew, before they were committed to writing'; (*c*) a few incidents which had been first current 'as traditions in the community where the document was produced'. As regards the contents of this source, Stanton goes so far as to suggest that it 'has supplied the greater part of the non-Marcan matter in the Gospel from the beginning of the Synoptic outline onwards' (p. 240). 'Most of the matter from it

[1] See Stanton's references to Burkitt's views in *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Part II, pp. 49, 76 n., 105 n.).

has been given in two portions, Lk. vi. 17–viii. 3 and Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14. But just as some of the earlier sections of the document have been introduced into the Synoptic outline before the first of these two insertions, so likewise a few have been given after the second of them' (p. 240).

Stanton has followed Weizsäcker in ascribing the authorship of this enlarged Logian document to some one other than St. Luke himself. In forming this opinion Stanton was influenced by the many close connexions between successive paragraphs in St. Luke's non-Markan contexts (e.g. xi. 27, 37, 53, xii. 1, 13, xiii. 1, 31, xvi. 14). He points out that in using Mk., St. Luke 'is careful not to create connexions in time which he did not find in his source' (p. 228). Hence he concludes that these temporal connexions 'were found by the Evangelist in his source, not invented by him' (p. 229). The author is probably to be looked for in 'a body of Jewish-Christians, returned Hellenists and others, to whom it was more natural to speak and write in Greek than in Aramaic, or who were at least capable of using Greek' (p. 239). The Evangelist himself, however, has further enlarged the document. He has 'added a few passages, gathered by him probably from oral tradition. In particular, the accounts of incidents in the history of the Passion and Appearance of the Risen Christ, peculiar to this Gospel, owe (it would seem) their written form to him' (p. 240). Elsewhere (pp. 291 ff.) in discussing the stylistic phenomena in St. Luke's 'peculiar' matter, Stanton notes nine sections whose literary form should in all probability be attributed solely to the Evangelist. These sections are as follows: v. 1–11, vii. 36–50, viii. 1–3, x. 29–37, xvii. 11–19, xix. 41–4, xxiii. 5–12, 14, 15, xxiii. 39–43, and xxiv.

In these extraordinarily interesting suggestions, the question arises whether Dr. Stanton did not unduly minimize the part played by the Evangelist himself in the authorship of the enlarged Logian document. Admittedly, the claim that the temporal connexions 'were found by the Evangelist in his source, not invented by him' does not exhaust the possibilities of the case; St. Luke, for example, might have supplied them from the tradition reported by his informants. Moreover, the parallel drawn from his treatment of Mk. may not be a perfect one. The circumstances need not have been the same; the

Evangelist, it might well be thought, was in closer touch with the personal factors lying behind his non-Markan source. These criticisms, however, may be deferred (see p. 209 f.). For the present it is enough to show the place which Stanton's theory may be thought to occupy in the development we are seeking to trace.

Part II of Stanton's *Gospels as Historical Documents* was published two years before the appearance of *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911). It is probable, however, that many of the essays included in that invaluable symposium had already taken shape when Dr. Stanton's work appeared.[1] All the more interesting is it, therefore, to note in the two volumes suggestions and theories which in certain respects run along parallel lines.

Certain remarks made by *Sir John C. Hawkins* in the course of his essay on *The Disuse of the Markan Source in St. Luke ix. 51–xviii. 14* (*O.S.S.*, pp. 29 ff.) first call for attention. Not that Sir John can be claimed as supporting either the theory of a special Lukan source or that of an enlarged Logian document; on the contrary, he is one of the strongest supporters of the Two Document Theory as it has been more commonly understood. None the less, in the course of his discussion of the 'larger interpolation' (Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14), he makes two suggestions which are of much interest and importance in connexion with our present discussion.

Hawkins thinks there must have been some definite cause for St. Luke's change of procedure at ix. 51. Only conjectures can be offered, and of the two which he makes, Hawkins says that 'perhaps they are hardly worth offering'. His first suggestion is as follows: 'Luke may have drawn up this "travel-document" with some special purpose before he knew of, or at least before he began to found a Gospel upon, the Marcan *Grundschrift*, and he may thus have had it ready to his hand for incorporation here'

[1] Note Bartlet's remark, *O.S.S.*, p. 356: 'The first draft of this essay was already complete when Prof. Stanton's judicial examination of the subject rendered a fresh testing of the matter desirable. On the whole his results do not differ widely from my own.' See also Hawkins's note, *O.S.S.*, p. 29: 'The first and third of these Studies are mainly reprinted, by the Editor's permission, from the *Expository Times* of 1902–4.'

(p. 55 f.). In favour of this supposition, Hawkins suggests that St. Luke 'would hardly have given so fully the closely parallel charges to the Twelve and to the Seventy in chaps. ix. and x., if he had drawn up the records of those two missions at or about the same time' (p. 56). Hawkins's second suggestion is that Mk. is laid aside possibly because 'at Caesarea or Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 8 ff., 15 ff.) or elsewhere, a more exact and chronological account of this final journey had been supplied to him by one who had at the time of the commencement of that journey become an "eyewitness and minister of the Word"' (p. 57). In this connexion attention is drawn to x. 1, which introduces the Charge to the Seventy, and to ix. 57–62, which refers to a preparatory sifting of disciples. The tradition reported by Epiphanius that St. Luke himself was one of the Seventy is 'all but impossible for us', in view of the distinction which St. Luke draws between the narrators, of whom he was one, and their informants ('eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word'), a conclusion which is supported by the words of the Muratorian fragment, '*Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne*'. 'We need not, however, put out of court so decidedly the conjecture that some other disciple, who had been one of the "Seventy", subsequently supplied Luke with many or most of the materials for his description of this journey, and especially with the order in which events occurred during it' (p. 58).

With true scientific caution, Hawkins points out that such conjectures and inferences are easily made too much of, with the result that discredit is brought upon the serious study of the Synoptic problem. 'They are only harmless if they are clearly and constantly and emphatically distinguished from such conclusions or working hypotheses as are supported by a preponderating, or at least a very substantial, amount of evidence' (p. 59). There Hawkins was content to leave the matter, but the question could not long be delayed whether, with due regard to the warning given, sufficient evidence might be found to warrant a further step. It will be seen that Hawkins's two suggestions are capable of being combined. Might not the 'travel-document' have been drawn up by St. Luke himself, before he knew of, or at least used, Mk., on the basis of information supplied by such informants as Hawkins mentions? It is this question, though

enlarged so as to cover the whole of St. Luke's non-Markan material from iii. 1 onwards, which is answered in the affirmative in Canon B. H. Streeter's important article in the *Hibbert Journal* for October 1921.

It falls to us next to describe yet another attempt to reconstruct a special source (other than Mk.) to which St. Luke had access in compiling the Third Gospel. This will be found in the essay of *Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet* on *The Sources of St. Luke's Gospel* in the *Oxford Studies*.

Dr. Bartlet himself describes his essay as 'of the nature of "a minority report"'. He rejects the current Two Document Hypothesis, for while he firmly believes that Mk. was one of the sources used by St. Luke, he denies the use, and indeed the existence, of a Q document containing the Sayings of Jesus.[1] His own theory is primarily a sort of Two Document Theory of St. Luke's Gospel alone (p. 316). He believes that St. Luke used a second written source 'alongside and indeed in preference to Mark', a source which was 'parallel with Mark even in sections which at first sight appear dependent on Mark alone' (p. 323). This special Lukan source Bartlet distinguishes by the symbol S.

In studying Dr. Bartlet's theory, it is important to understand his peculiar use of the symbol Q. This is used, not of a document containing sayings or discourses, but apparently as the equivalent of such expressions as 'the basal tradition' and 'the common Apostolic tradition'.[2] The symbol QL is used to describe this oral tradition, so far as we find it in the Third Gospel—a tradition which includes narrative matter, Logia, and an account of the Passion (pp. 331-6).

One of the problems with which Dr. Bartlet was faced was to determine the relation between S and this oral Q. This question is discussed in considerable detail, and everywhere the same answer is returned. The Q matter, it is said, had already taken

[1] Cf. p. 315, also p. 359: 'I can see no evidence that Q was ever written down before it was so in Luke's S.'

[2] 'I am a little inclined to regret the use of the symbol Q, which in the rest of our volume has a fairly fixed connotation, for this comparatively new entity postulated by Dr. Bartlet' (Sanday, *O.S.S.*, p. xix f.). Sanday points out that Bartlet seems to use Q as = the general Apostolic teaching, defined in particular directions (QM, QMk, QL).

written shape within S; in other words, S and QL had been fused together by the author of S.

It is this presumption which explains why Mk. and S have so much in common; basal Q lies beneath both. Hence it is that in many sections, from the account of John's preaching onwards, S and Mk. follow parallel lines. Parallel as they are, S and Mk. are none the less separate and distinct. In the language and characteristic ideas of S we have criteria which clearly bespeak a written non-Markan source.[1]

The incorporation of QL with S explains also the freedom with which Mk. is ignored and at times traversed in the Passion narrative. That such a fusion had indeed taken place Bartlet infers from the 'natural, psychological sequence' visible in the Lukan story of the Passion. To isolate the S element in the story is impossible. The S sections 'do not form or even suggest a continuous whole such as we should expect to find in a written document or primitive Gospel' (p. 335). We are in fact limited to two alternatives. Either the anecdotes peculiar to the Third Gospel have been inserted from time to time by the Evangelist from his note-book, or else they reached him already fused with QL. It is the latter view which Bartlet endorses.

The same fusion appears in the matter dealing with events immediately preceding the Passion, and it is found in xxiv. (witness the close relation of the story of the two going to Emmaus (S) with the rest of the chapter). It is the historical unity of the two elements (S and QL) in the last stage of the ministry of Jesus which leads Bartlet to infer their fusion in a document at St. Luke's disposal.

In the 'Great Insertion' evidence is found which appears to throw light upon the identity of the author of S. Once more it is clear that he has fused his special information with the QL tradition. This is seen in the linking on of the great Mission Charge to the Dispatch and Return of the Seventy. Accepting

[1] As regards style, Bartlet instances such features as the use of the ἐγένετο constructions, followed by the finite verb with or without καὶ (αὐτός, ἰδού), the use of the impf. of 'to be' with a participle, and the pleonastic use of 'began'. Parallelism, which goes deeper, is found in such passages as ix. 45 and xviii. 34. Under 'Ideas' Bartlet instances the notion that the disciples' obtuseness was due to Divine action, and the references to the fulfilment of Scripture in Jesus' career, especially His suffering and death.

these episodes as historical, Bartlet finds the medium of this tradition in 'some one in specially close touch with the second circle of Jesus' personal followers, "the rest" spoken of in Lk. xxiv. 9, cf. 33, to whom reference is made in Acts i. 21 in connexion with the filling of the gap in the inner circle of the Twelve (p. 344). Such a man, it is suggested, would meet in early Jerusalem days some one who had served among the Seventy, and so hear and preserve their special tradition.[1] Like Stanton, Bartlet thinks that the 'links' within the 'Great Insertion' belonged to the source itself; they are to be attributed to the author of S and not to St. Luke. This view is extended so as to include the Lukan parables. The crucial instance is the conjunction of the Scribe's Question regarding the Great Commandment (QL) with the Parable of the Good Samaritan (S). For the origin of this conjunction Bartlet decides that we must go behind St. Luke to his source (p. 347), and inasmuch as other Lukan parables open with the same formula ('A certain man') it is 'natural to infer that they, too, came to Luke already united with his QL matter in the special source' (p. 348).[2] Thus, everywhere from iii. 1 onwards, Bartlet finds reason to presuppose a written source S, which consists of special traditions, furnished by an eyewitness or an associate of eyewitnesses, which have been fused with the common Apostolic tradition, the oral deposit which lies behind all the Gospels.

Bartlet now turns to the discussion of the question of the *form* in which S came to St. Luke. That it lay before the Evangelist in a written shape, he says, hardly needs arguing further. But why has it left no trace in tradition or in Mt.? Bartlet's

[1] Bartlet pictures a wider circle of witnesses, some of whom were more cultivated in mind and more liberal in sympathies than the framers of the official tradition. 'One who moved in such circles, and was also in personal contact with the Twelve themselves . . . would gradually gather much the sort of traditions, more or less grouped according to affinities of idea, that we find in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14' (p. 345).

[2] 'It looks . . . as if the Lucan form of opening to so many parables were a mannerism of the S type of tradition, whether it was transmitting common Q matter (QL) or parts of the apostolic tradition peculiar to itself (S proper)' (p. 348). 'Both the Lucan parables and his whole teaching as to riches and the breadth of Christ's Gospel towards sinners, tax-collectors, and Samaritans, suggest that Luke's special tradition had passed through the medium of some Hellenistic circle of Palestinian Christianity, which has acted by selective affinity on its contents, and has to some extent influenced its language and style' (p. 349).

interesting suggestion is that S never passed into circulation; it was written by its author for St. Luke, in response to his inquiries, or by St. Luke himself, virtually from his informant's lips. In any case the tradition cannot have reached St. Luke from a number of persons in different circles and at very different dates. 'Its homogeneity is too great to be the product of even a single circle of tradition. It bears the impress of a single selective and unifying mind, other than and prior to that of the Evangelist himself, though one congenial to his own' (p. 350). Perhaps the most attractive statement of Dr. Bartlet's theory is the following: 'Thus S was a peculiar form of written memoirs elicited by our Third Evangelist *ad hoc*, not immediately for the literary purpose to which he finally put it, but rather as a permanent record of the most authentic tradition to which it had been his lot to obtain access, for use in his own work as an evangelist or catechist of the oral Gospel' (p. 351).

Dr. Bartlet suggests that S was probably written down while St. Luke was in Caesarea along with St. Paul. The intimate and consecutive character of the narrative of the Jerusalem ministry, the traditions touching Jesus and the Samaritans, and other features point to Philip the Evangelist (Acts xxi. 8 f.) as St. Luke's chief informant. Philip may have known some of the Seventy, while for tradition concerning the earlier Galilean days he may have been indebted to St. John. The degree of editorial treatment S underwent when worked into St. Luke's Gospel was probably inconsiderable, and was due mainly to concern for ordered sequence, especially at the opening of sections and in a lesser degree at their close.

Such then, in outline, is Dr. Bartlet's contribution to the problem of St. Luke's sources. Its assured place in the history of the discussion cannot be doubted. Its importance lies, not so much in the enunciation of positions likely to win permanent assent, as in the fact that it raises fresh issues and supplies full and detailed material for their discussion. Dr. Bartlet has himself pointed out the features common to Dr. Stanton's views and his own: (1) the belief that a single document supplied the greater part of the non-Markan matter in Lk., (2) the opinion that this document embodied a form of Q differing considerably from that known to Mt., and even to Mk., (3) the suggestion that

the matter additional to Q, which the enlarged document contained, represented traditions current in southern Palestine. The differences between the two writers relate to (1) the stage at which Q passed into written form, and (2) the passages added by St. Luke himself from oral tradition, including some in the history of the Passion and Resurrection.

Before leaving this section, it will be well to discuss certain objections to Dr. Bartlet's theory, to some of which he himself refers.

(1) The first, mentioned by Dr. Bartlet (p. 354), is 'the large extent of the special source'. In answer to this objection, it is pointed out that Mk. was itself based on Apostolic tradition 'already stereotyped in its salient features, at any rate as current in the Jerusalem Church'. It may be doubted if this answer is really sufficient. That there was an oral tradition which played its part in the composition of the Gospels is recognized by upholders of the Two Document Theory.[1] There is, then, no *a priori* objection to the view that S included sections parallel to those in Mk. The more pertinent consideration is that Dr. Bartlet is not successful in proving that St. Luke is indebted to S in contexts where it has been usual to think that his only source is Mk. (e. g. in iv. 31–44, v. 12–vi. 11, viii. 4–ix. 50, xviii. 15–43, xix. 29–36, 45 f., xx. 1–xxii. 13). Grant to the Third Evangelist a reasonable amount of legitimate editorial freedom in dealing with Mk. in these sections, and there is no need to posit any other written source. The variations, stylistic and otherwise, between Lk. and Mk. in these passages do not point to anything so definite as a second written source.[2] The alleged Hebraisms (not Aramaisms) are adequately explained by the influence of the LXX upon St. Luke's style.[3] These contentions, if sound, do not of course weaken the case for the existence of S; they merely reduce its extent to more reasonable limits.

(2) In the second place, exception must be taken to the attempt to derive the Sayings and Discourses common to Lk. and

[1] Cf. Stanton, *G.H.D.*, ii, pp. 130 ff.

[2] Unless it be in ix. 28–36 (The Transfiguration), 37–43 a (The Epileptic Lad), 43 a–5 (Second Prediction of the Passion), and xx. 34–6 ('The Sons of this World'), and even in these cases the inference is far from certain.

[3] Cf. Moulton, *Gk. Gr.*, ii. 18 ff., and Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 11 ff.

Mt. from an oral Q. It is really much too late in the day to return to this hypothesis. The close verbal agreement of the two Gospels in so many passages, some of them of considerable extent, requires us to assume the use of a Q document.[1] The divergences, which are certainly serious, call for necessary modifications of the documentary hypothesis,[2] but not its rejection. Nor is it reasonable to deny the existence of a written Q because of the fragmentary reconstructions which alone are possible, or because tradition has preserved no trace of Q beyond the disputed reference in the words of Papias. We must make of Q what we can; the double phenomenon of verbal agreement and of order is too striking to be explained away. The rejection of Bartlet's theory regarding Q does not, however, remove anything that is really essential to his general hypothesis. If we posit a Q document, the construction of such a source as S is quite as conceivable. Once more, as in the case of the last section, we have a modification of Bartlet's theory, not its rejection.

(3) In some ways the strongest objection is the fact that the theory under discussion seems to reduce St. Luke's part in the composition of his Gospel to a minimum—a difficulty which Dr. Bartlet fully appreciates. The Evangelist's work is reduced to 'the blending of his two authorities, and the smoothing of the style of the whole into something like unity, as well as conformity to the literary and other requirements of his own circle of readers' (p. 355). Dr. Bartlet himself puts the objection very clearly when he says: 'This many will feel contrary to their previous impressions of the purport of Luke's own preface.' Dr. Bartlet's answer to this difficulty will hardly be thought satisfactory. 'Does that preface', he asks, 'really suggest anything as to Luke's use of written sources at all?' The real question is, Does the preface express the consciousness of author-

[1] See the passages in Hawkins's Class A (*O.S.S.*, p. 113).

[2] e.g. the use of different translations or recensions, the influence of oral tradition, and possibly of other written sources. It is unreasonable, with Lummis (*How Luke was Written*, pp. 27 ff.), to object to such qualifications of the documentary theory. The plea that the use of Mt. by Lk. is a much simpler hypothesis (so Lummis) is particularly unconvincing. The divergences alone rule out that expedient. On the other hand, Bartlet's claim that the oral theory is 'the simplest explanation of the highly complex phenomena' breaks down in the light of the agreements. So close are the latter, that if the use of Mt. by Lk. is denied, the dependence of both upon a common document (Q) is the inevitable inference.

ship? St. Luke describes his 'special advantages' when he claims to have followed the course of all things accurately from the first, and, difficult as the words are to explain, they require something more than the suggestion that he has dovetailed two documents and smoothed out the style of the whole. One has no sooner felt the full force of this objection, however, than the question arises, Might not the theory be so presented as to leave room for the implications of St. Luke's preface? As we have seen, Stanton distinguished at least nine passages in the non-Markan parts of the Gospel as due solely to the Evangelist himself, and it is probable that this is a minimum statement of St. Luke's literary activity. When, moreover, the theories of Stanton and Bartlet are viewed together, the question at once leaps into view: Is there lying behind the Third Gospel a non-Markan source, of which St. Luke himself is in the full sense the author; in other words, a Proto-Luke document?

(4) The last point to be raised concerns the place to be assigned to Mk. and S respectively in the composition of Lk. Strictly speaking, we cannot complain if Dr. Bartlet does not discuss this question, since the object of his essay is to describe and to delimit the sources which have been used. Nevertheless, immediately such a document as S has to be posited, the manner in which it is used in relation to Mk. becomes a question of first-rate importance. To which source did the Evangelist assign the greater value, and which has he made the framework of his Gospel? On Dr. Bartlet's theory, S is of such dimensions that one wonders why Mk. was used at all. It is obvious that the question could not long remain unnoticed, In what way is Mk. used in the Third Gospel? Is it the framework of Lk.? The more closely S is defined, the more strongly does this question press for solution, and it presses strongest of all if S is thought to have been written by St. Luke. Nine years, however, were to elapse before the question should be answered in Streeter's hypothesis.

At this point it will be useful to refer to *Dr. Sanday's remarks regarding Dr. Bartlet's views* in the introductory chapter of the *Oxford Studies* (pp. xix ff.). Dr. Sanday describes Dr. Bartlet's work as a 'strong and detailed essay'. He is

a little inclined to regret the use of the symbol Q for the 'comparatively new entity postulated by Dr. Bartlet'. From this part of the theory he feels compelled, provisionally at least, to dissent, but in the part relating to St. Luke's special source there is a great deal that he cordially welcomes. 'It seems to me a valuable suggestion that "S was a peculiar form of written memoirs elicited by our Third Evangelist *ad hoc*, not immediately for the literary purpose to which he finally put it, but rather as a permanent record of the most authentic tradition to which it had been his lot to obtain access, for use in his own work as an evangelist or catechist of the oral Gospel".' He can altogether go along with the view that St. Luke probably collected this material during his two years' stay at Caesarea from the information supplied by Philip the Evangelist and his four daughters with, perhaps, other members of the Caesarean circle. He agrees further that the information derived in this way probably lay before St. Luke in writing. 'Over all this ground', he writes, 'Dr. Bartlet has in me a whole-hearted ally.'

The only point in regard to S from which he is inclined to dissent is its supposed inclusion of Q material. On this head he says he is aware that he would have himself to be on the defensive. 'It has been to me rather strange that so many advocates of a special source as underlying the Third Gospel have accepted this inclusion. So Feine, who was the first to put forward the hypothesis of a special source (1891), Johannes Weiss in the eighth edition of Meyer's Commentary (1892), Dr. V. H. Stanton (1909), and now Dr. Bartlet. But I confess that to me this form of the theory seems to defeat a part at least of the object for which it was propounded.' The object in view in positing a special source is twofold. On the one hand, it is a receptacle for the matter peculiar to Lk.; on the other hand, it provides an explanation of the variations between Lk. and Mt in respect of Q matter. The latter difficulty Sanday prefers to explain by the view that the two Evangelists did not always follow the same version of Q. He points out that if QL was already part of S, St. Luke had no such other version. 'We should have, quite unnecessarily, to push the divergence further back,' and this 'when our object is to economize stages as much

as possible'. 'For my own part therefore,' he concludes, 'I believe that St. Luke was the first to carry out the fusion.'

It will be seen from the above that Dr. Sanday was disposed to regard favourably the hypothesis of a special source containing material collected by St. Luke, provided the fusion of this material with Q can be viewed as the work of the Evangelist. The relation of this part of St. Luke's task to his use of Mk. is not discussed, and Dr. Sanday recognizes quite frankly that the theory of a special source as used by St. Luke is a position not yet established. His closing sentence is so full of significance for our investigation that it must be given in full: 'But I should like to ask whether it is not possible to rally round the clear and sharply drawn definition of Q as it is presented to us in the earlier essays, and so pass on to the closer testing of the supplementary hypothesis of St. Luke's special source.' These are indeed prophetic words, when we remember that it is B. H. Streeter, the author of some of the essays to which Dr. Sanday refers, who has taken the very step described. Without departing in any essential particular from the Two Document Theory, Streeter has passed on 'to the closer testing of the supplementary hypothesis of St. Luke's special source', and has found reason to include this hypothesis in a comprehensive view of the origin of the Third Gospel.

Before we discuss Streeter's Proto-Luke Hypothesis a last pleasing task remains. Consideration must first be given to the work of American scholars, and in particular to an invaluable contribution to Lukan source-criticism which has been made by *Mr. A. M. Perry* in his book, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative* (1920).

Mr. Perry builds upon the work of Professors E. D. Burton[1] and C. C. Torrey[2] and upon foundations furnished by Hawkins, Burkitt, and Stanton. Following Burton, Perry substitutes for Q two non-Markan documents, one embodied in the Lukan account of the Galilean Ministry (G) and the other embodied in the 'Perean' section (P). He holds, however, that his results

[1] *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem* (Chicago, 1904); also *Some Phases of the Synoptic Problem* (*J.B.L.*, xxxi (1912), Part II, pp. 95–113).

[2] *The Composition and Date of Acts.*

are equally available for those who accept the Two Document Theory. To a very considerable extent this is true, for, apart from the opening chapter in which he discusses the Evangelist's literary method, his investigations are limited to the Lukan Passion narrative. After a remarkably thorough examination of this narrative, Perry reaches the conclusion that it has been taken by the Evangelist from a non-Markan source, which he designates as J or the 'Jerusalem source'. J was a Greek document, probably a translation from the Aramaic, and was produced in the Christian community at Jerusalem about the year A. D. 45 by a writer who may have been a disciple of Jesus and an eyewitness of the events he describes (*op. cit.*, p. 106). Thus, the Evangelist's sources are Mk., G, P, and J. In the course of its incorporation in the Third Gospel, J has been modified in various ways and has received a number of additions from the Markan source. It is not possible to reproduce in detail Mr. Perry's arguments. There is perhaps a tendency to over-precision and an undue emphasis upon phenomena, linguistic and otherwise, which are thought to establish a distinction between the author of J and the Third Evangelist. It would, however, be ungenerous even to mention these things without a clear recognition of the permanent contribution which this American scholar has made in the view that a non-Markan source is the principal basis of the Lukan Passion narrative.

The early date of J is open to question, especially if Perry is justified in including in the Passion narrative the Apocalyptic Discourse of Lk. xxi. The denial of the Lukan authorship of J is also a doubtful position. Considerable reliance is placed upon the vocabulary and style of J. Mr. Perry himself recognizes that much of the vocabulary depends upon the subject-matter treated, and that great variety is to be expected in the case of a writer like the Third Evangelist. It is doubtful, however, if he adds much to his theory by dwelling upon such phenomena as the presence of exact details in J, descriptive touches, redundancies, and 'tacked-on particulars', all of which are accounted for if the Evangelist had access to autoptic testimony. Nor are the 'thought and viewpoint' of J irreconcilable with the Evangelist's authorship. The emphasis upon the humanity of Christ, the restrained character of the eschatology of J, its teaching regarding

Salvation and Society, do not require us to presuppose an earlier writer. Perry's theory is also open to the objection that it reduces the work of the Evangelist who wrote i. 1–4 to that of a mere compiler. It is a further matter for inquiry if J is such a fixed entity as Mr. Perry thinks it to be. 'The interest of J in Jesus centres about His death; but G and P are concerned chiefly with His teaching and saving activities, and hardly make mention of the event which is central for J' (*op. cit.*, p. 100). This and similar arguments are of doubtful value. At the proper place we shall state the case for regarding the Lukan Passion narrative as the natural sequel of the earlier non-Markan sections of Lk. All that need be mentioned here is the manifest interest taken in the journey to Jerusalem from Lk. ix. 51 onwards, and the importance of such passages as Lk. xii. 50, xiii. 33, 35.

None of these criticisms, however, touches the central thesis of Mr. Perry's book—the non-Markan character of J and its high historical value. Like Burkitt, Perry holds that in many of its peculiar features 'the narrative is inherently more probable' than Mk. 'in its details and relation' (p. 99). The writer 'possessed the insight and breadth of view which are essential to accurate writing' (p. 99). He had the sympathetic understanding which enabled him to write 'with a certain degree of objectivity' and to criticize the traditions presented to him (p. 100). It is in such opinions that the real merit of Mr. Perry's book lies. Canon Streeter's tribute[1] is no more than just, for, without such painstaking work as that of Mr. Perry, the Proto-Luke Theory would lose one of its strongest foundations.

The way is now open to discuss *Canon Streeter's Hypothesis*. An important article in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1921, first stated the Proto-Luke Theory. This article has since been expanded and strengthened in a valuable chapter in Streeter's recent book, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (1924). In presenting his theory, Streeter presupposes (1) the priority of Mk. and Q, (2) the view that Mk. and Q overlapped, and (3) the contention of Sir John Hawkins, that no use of Mk. is

[1] 'The most thorough attempt I know to unravel Luke's sources is *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, A. M. Perry (Chicago, 1920)' (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 217 n.).

made by the Third Evangelist in Lk. vi. 20–viii. 3 and Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14.

In the passages named above we have two uninterrupted blocks of non-Markan material, which contain Q matter and material peculiar to Lk. (L) in the proportion of two parts of the former to three of the latter. If the Lukan Parable of the Pounds rests upon the same source as the Matthaean Parable of the Talents (Harnack, *et al.*), we have in Lk. xix. 1–27 a third block containing matter from Q and L. A fourth section is Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30, a point which Streeter regards as fundamental to his argument. In this section there are certainly points of contact with Mk., but practically nothing which is derived from Mk. The accounts of John's preaching, the Baptism, and the Temptation are from Q. Again, St. Luke's account of the Resurrection Appearances is from a non-Markan source, while the account of the Last Supper and the Passion (xxii. 14–xxiv. 12) 'looks more like an originally independent version of the story, enriched by certain additions from St. Mark, than like a modification of St. Mark's version'.

Streeter now points out that the non-Markan sections would form 'a complete gospel'. They 'form the framework of the Third Gospel, and into this framework are inserted at convenient places extracts from the Gospel of Mark'. In the case of Mt. Mk. is the primary source; in the case of Lk. the framework is QL. Streeter contends that this view does not conflict with the Two Document Hypothesis. What he desires to do is to interpolate a stage between Q and the edition of the Third Gospel. This edition had not Q in its original form, but QL. QL may be called Proto-Luke; it is slightly longer than Mk. and less than a third consists of Q matter. The author of Proto-Luke may well be St. Luke himself, and our present Third Gospel may be his much later and enlarged edition of his own earlier work.

Streeter urges that his hypothesis is suggested by the following facts: (1) In Lk. Markan and non-Markan materials 'are distributed, as it were, in alternate stripes'; (2) the beginning and end of the Gospel are non-Markan; (3) the non-Markan portions are greater in extent; (4) iii. 1 reads 'as if originally it stood at the beginning of a book', while the position of the Genealogy

(iii. 23 ff.) is strange; (5) in certain sections St. Luke omits St. Mark's version and gives another version in a *completely different context.* To the last-named point Streeter attaches considerable importance, and as examples he cites the Beelzebub Controversy (xi. 14–23), the Parable of the Mustard Seed (xiii. 18 f.), the Rejection at Nazareth (iv. 16–30), the story of the Anointing (vii. 36 ff.), and the Great Commandment (x. 25–8). In these cases St. Luke's version is fuller and more interesting, but in other cases it is not so (e. g. the Saying about Salt in xiv. 34, the Discourse on Divorce in xvi. 18, and the contrast between the Rulers of the Gentiles and the Son of Man in xxii. 24–7). From these facts Streeter deduces that St. Luke's preference is for the source QL as a whole. The contrast presented by St. Matthew's procedure in the sections mentioned above is striking. St. Matthew conflates Mk. and Q, whereas St. Luke either discards Mk. altogether, or takes over only a few words. The First Evangelist, moreover, in sharp contrast with St. Luke, prefers the context given by Mk. To QL, as described above, the following passages should probably be added: iv. 14 f., v. 1–11, vi. 14–16, xix. 37–44, and perhaps xxi. 18, 34–6. Editorial improvements only are probably to be recognized in ix. 28–30, xx. 34–8, and xxii. 3, 8.

In contrast with Mr. Perry, Canon Streeter lays comparatively little stress upon linguistic evidence in its bearing on the authorship of the non-Markan material. He notes, as characteristic of the author of QL, the use of κύριε and ὁ κύριος. The absence of sufficiently distinctive linguistic features, however, is important. So far as it goes, it favours the view that Q and L were originally combined by the same editor who subsequently united Q + L with Mk. to form our present Gospel (*op. cit.*, p. 214 n.).

Streeter finds the author of Proto-Luke in 'Luke the companion of Paul' (p. 218). He points out that this suggestion does not admit either of verification or refutation to anything like the same extent as the fact of the existence of QL, which is 'to a considerable extent capable of verification'. His main reason for affirming the Lukan authorship of QL is the similarity of 'tendency' in this document as compared with the Gospel and the Acts. 'The special tastes, sympathies, and characteristics of the author are equally conspicuous in the parts of the Gospel

derived from Proto-Luke, in those which we must attribute to the editor of the whole, in the first part of Acts, in the "We-Sections", and in the final editor of Acts' (p. 219). Like other portions of the Lukan writings, QL is marked by special knowledge of Herod's court, by its interest in Samaria and Samaritans, by its emphasis upon Christ as the Saviour of the world, accepted by Gentiles but rejected by His own people, and by its evident interest in the poor, in women, in sinners and outcasts. Streeter finds no difficulty in the fact that the author of Proto-Luke sometimes prefers the more to the less miraculous of two versions of the same story laid before him, for this 'is in the widest sense of the term a "Lucan" characteristic'. The 'atmosphere' of QL and the other parts of Lukan works 'has a subtle individuality which reflects, not a Church tradition, but a personality of a very exceptional kind' (p. 221).

In the *Hibbert* article (p. 112) Streeter suggested that Proto-Luke was compiled in Caesarea about A. D. 60, partly from an early copy of Q, but mainly from traditional material, some oral, some possibly already written down. In *The Four Gospels* he has made the better suggestion of a somewhat later date. During the two years at Caesarea St. Luke made his notes. 'Later on, probably not till after the death of Paul, a copy of Q came his way, and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the place where he was then living. Still later a copy of Mark came his way, and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel that has come down to us' (p. 219). Replying to Dr. Headlam's preference[1] for two stages in the composition of the Gospel before it was put into circulation rather than two editions, Streeter says that he has no particular objection to this modification of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. 'All I am concerned to argue is that Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel; but it is quite likely that it was only meant for what in modern phrase would be called "private circulation"' (p. 221).

For the historical value of Proto-Luke Canon Streeter makes high claims. If the theory is accepted 'we must recognize in

[1] Cf. *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, p. 20 f.

Proto-Luke the existence of another authority comparable to Mark' (p. 222).

> 'Where the two are parallel it would seem that Proto-Luke is sometimes inferior in historical value (e.g. in the details of the Call of Peter), sometimes superior (e.g. the addition of an account of the trial before Herod). Neither Mark nor Proto-Luke are infallible; but as historical authorities they should probably be regarded as on the whole of approximately equal value. But, if so, this means that far more weight will have to be given by the historian in the future to the Third Gospel, and in particular to those portions of it which are peculiar to itself' (p. 222).

The striking interest and signal merits of the above theory cannot be doubted. Its truth will be the subject investigated in the following pages, but meantime attention must be drawn to the place which it occupies in the development of thought traced in the present chapter. The theory is certainly no 'bolt from the blue'; on the contrary, it is the climax of a series of well-ordered steps.

Along with Feine, B. Weiss, and J. Weiss, Streeter holds that a special Lukan source is incorporated in the Third Gospel, but, unlike these scholars, he does not present us with a mere string of fragments. Like Feine, Stanton, and Bartlet, he posits a source in which Lukan material is fused with Q matter; but St. Luke's part in the formation of this source is asserted to an extent which transcends that suggested by any of these writers. A comparison of Streeter's theory with that of Dr. Bartlet is especially interesting. Each of the four objections to which Bartlet's theory lies open is amply met in Streeter's hypothesis. Thus, Proto-Luke is of more modest dimensions than Bartlet's S, and so allows for a fuller use of Mk. Again, unlike Bartlet, Streeter assumes the Two Document Hypothesis.[1] He also sketches a theory which does full justice to the implications of St. Luke's preface. Finally, he fully considers the manner in which Mk. and the special source have each been used in the composition of the Third Gospel. Reverting to the tentative suggestion of Sir John Hawkins regarding the origin of the 'travel-document' in ix. 51–xviii. 14, we cannot fail to notice

[1] Modified in *The Four Gospels* (pp. 223 ff.) into a Four Document Hypothesis.

how Streeter's theory includes these views, while, as we have seen, it carries out exactly the method projected in Dr. Sanday's plea, that from the acceptance of the Two Document Hypothesis research should be extended in the direction of St. Luke's special source. The frank recognition of Canon Streeter's debt to earlier workers in no way dims the brilliance and originality of his theory. On the contrary, it is the more satisfactory to find that it stands in a path the earlier stages of which have been well and wisely trodden. Indeed, the entire course of the development we have been tracing shows that, in spite of apparent confusion, there is real progress in Synoptic Criticism.

NOTE.—In respect of the details of Canon Streeter's theory there is naturally room for differences of opinion. The attempt to include portions of the Apocalyptic Discourse in QL (xxi. 18, 34–6) is, as Streeter recognizes, a tentative suggestion. A. M. Perry claimed very considerable portions of Lk. xxi. for his Jerusalem source, but it is doubtful if such views can be sustained. Canon Streeter rightly points out that the reconstruction of QL from xxii. 14 is 'in points of detail highly speculative'. It is probable, however, that he makes too great a concession in the opinion that from xxiii. 33 to xxiv. 10 a 'Luke reverses his ordinary procedure and makes Mark his main source' (p. 217). In advocating the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, there is a not unnatural tendency to underestimate St. Luke's debt to Mk., and against this tendency Streeter is rightly on his guard. In the Crucifixion Story, however, many of the words which Lk. shares with Mk. are found in a few verses, which are capable of being regarded as 'insertions' in a non-Markan source (so Perry. See also later, pp. 55 ff.). As regards the Burial Story, the case is different, and here St. Luke's debt is mainly to Mk. As to the possibility that the Fourth Evangelist may have known Proto-Luke, Streeter prefers the alternative view that he knew the Third Gospel (see p. 408). Streeter recognizes that the words of xxii. 15 ('With desire,' &c.) suggest the view that in St. Luke's source the Last Supper was conceived as taking place on the day before the Passover, but says that they do not quite compel this suggestion (p. 423). In the light of the Lukan story of the Supper as a whole, a more definite opinion seems possible (see later, pp. 37, 228 f.).

§ 2. *The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: Methods and Principles of Investigation.*

The remainder of the present work will consist of an attempt to discuss the grounds for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. There are several reasons why such a discussion is desirable. It is, as

we have seen, in Streeter's hypothesis that the course of recent Synoptic Criticism already described appears to find an end, and, if the position attained proves to be unstable, it is essential that we should return as soon as possible to firmer ground. On the other hand, if it is sound, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis involves such far-reaching consequences that it is necessary to test it thoroughly both in itself and in the light of its implications. Not the least of these consequences is the fact that it completely reverses the commonly accepted theory of the composition of the Third Gospel, according to which the framework is supplied by Mk., material from Q and other matter peculiar to Lk. having been inserted into this foundation by the Evangelist. If Streeter is right, the framework is Proto-Luke. Out of this situation arises the result to which Streeter himself has drawn attention—the necessity of viewing Proto-Luke as an authority 'comparable to Mark' and indeed 'entirely independent of Mark'. When we reflect that, on the ordinary view, Mk. is sometimes our sole authority for events in the life of Jesus, and almost always our earliest authority, the importance of the Proto-Luke Theory can hardly be exaggerated.

Again, it has long been noticed that Lk. has quite a number of features which it shares with the Fourth Gospel. The important consideration for our present investigation is that the great majority of these belong to non-Markan contexts. Thus the Proto-Luke Hypothesis has a bearing on that supreme problem of New Testament Criticism—the historical value of the Fourth Gospel. Another consequence of the theory is the enhanced value which must be given to the narratives and to the teaching peculiar to St. Luke. A further point is the reflected light that is thrown upon an admittedly dark spot in the story of the New Testament—the circumstances under which the Gospel Writings came into being. Finally, the theological implications of the theory are of the highest importance. We cannot, it is true, on the basis of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, forthwith assign its teaching to the seventh decade of the first century without further inquiry. For, even if we can prove Proto-Luke to be of that date, the document must none the less have been modified to a greater or lesser extent when it was used in the composition of the Gospel. Still the conservative way in which St. Luke is

thought to have treated his sources (cf. Harnack [1]) encourages the hope that, if the Proto-Luke Hypothesis can be sustained, its theological importance will be great. All these possibilities, whether they can be realized or not, make a close investigation of Streeter's hypothesis imperative.

As the first step must necessarily be the delimitation of Markan and non-Markan material in Lk., it may be useful to bring clearly before the reader the *principles* to be applied. It is especially important to remember that the value of these tests lies in their cumulative force; rarely can they be thought sufficient in cases where they stand alone.

(1) First of all, it is important to make a count of all the words, or parts of words, which are common to parallel sections in Lk. and Mk. The percentage of *common words* is of great value in discussing the question of Markan or non-Markan origin. It goes without saying that this test is subject to many qualifications. Two narratives giving independent versions of the same story or discourse may reasonably be expected to have many words in common. When, however, the percentage is very high indeed, it is reasonable to infer the dependence of one upon the other, or of both upon a common source. None the less, even in such cases our inferences cannot be treated as certainties; other tests than those of statistics must be applied, if we are to have confidence in our conclusions. The same is true in cases where the percentage is low. Here the natural presumption is that the parallel narratives are of independent origin, but, in view of the possibility of free editorial handling, other tests must be made. More ambiguous still must be the issue when the percentage of 'common words' is neither high nor low. In the last two cases we must be careful to note the presence of any *unusual* words, that is to say, words which would not be likely to suggest themselves to two writers treating independently the same topic. Possible examples are θανατόω [2] in Mk. xiii. 12 and Lk. xxi. 16, ἐρήμωσις [3] in Mk. xiii. 14 and Lk. xxi. 20, and the phrase πρὸς τὸ φῶς [4] in Mk. xiv. 53 and Lk. xxii. 56. The need for these qualifications does not suggest that the test is valueless;

[1] Cf. *The Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 39, 113.
[2] The word occurs in Mk. twice and in Lk. once.
[3] In the NT the word is found only here and in the parallel passage in Mt. xxiv. 15.
[4] Cf. *D.C.G.*, i. 595.

it simply means that great care must be taken in applying it. When all the objections are recognized, it still remains true that the extent of linguistic agreement is a very important factor. Apart from its positive value in relation to source-usage, it is especially useful, as will be seen in the following pages, in raising questions; it acts as a signpost and as a note of interrogation.

(2) Quite as important as the percentage of 'common words' in Lk. and Mk. is the question of their *distribution*. When, for instance, we find a very low percentage, and yet in one or two verses, or portions of verses, a thick cluster of words common to both narratives, the question is raised whether in these verses we have not a Markan addition or insertion.[1] Once more the test is subject to the disabilities mentioned in the preceding section; it requires to be fortified by other considerations if it is to stand. On the other hand, it would be foolish in the extreme to neglect so important a finger-post as that provided by the facts of distribution. If it leads us to a cul-de-sac, we can turn back again, bu if we neglect it we may get nowhere.

(3) As additional to the statistical tests described above, the question of *order* is of very great importance. Where narratives follow one another in two works in the same succession, it is reasonable to suspect dependence, especially if no apparent reason can be found why one narrative should follow another. On the other hand, where, in addition to disparity in respect of words and phrases, the order in which narratives are given varies, without appearing to be deliberate, the theory of independent origin becomes very strong. It is perfectly true that oral tradition may well explain striking coincidences of both agreement and disagreement in respect of order; this fact must not be forgotten. But the fixity of oral tradition can never be quite the same thing as that of a document. As regards the astonishing similarity of order manifest in the parallel sections of Lk. iii.–xxi. 4 and Mk. i.–xii., the objection can have little force. As regards the dissimilarity of order in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. as compared with Mk. xiv.–xvi., the problem is more complex.

(4) A fourth test is the presence of indications pointing

[1] A striking case is the *combined* references to the Miraculous Darkness and the Rending of the Temple Veil in Lk. xxiii. 44 f. In Mk. xv. 33 and 38 these portents are mentioned separately. See p. 58.

strongly to *stylistic improvements* and *editorial modification*. The two may be taken together, inasmuch as when present at all they generally occur side by side. These phenomena are important when there is reason to suspect the dependence of one narrative upon another. Where, amidst considerable linguistic agreement, a variation presents itself of such a nature that the different words used are characteristic of the writers, this fact must be added to, not subtracted from the argument for dependence. In the same way, a difference which most naturally commends itself as a conscious alteration, because it is explanatory or because it removes a patent difficulty, is also an added ground for the theory of dependence.

(5) A fifth test is that of *inherent harmony*. It is applied whenever we ask in what relation a suspected passage stands to its context. Does it break the order of thought? Is it more naturally explained as an intrusion, a later stratum? Admittedly, this test is highly subjective, and one can have little confidence in it when it stands alone. Writers have the elementary right to be illogical, or, at any rate, their logic need not be that of their critics. It is perhaps true to say that the reckless use of this test has done more to disparage Higher Criticism than anything else. But be this as it may, it is impossible to exclude the test, provided it is associated with others of a more objective character.

(6) A further principle of much importance in its bearing upon the use of sources is that of intelligibility in the manner of their employment. In applying this principle, we have to be on our guard lest we introduce into our attempts at reconstruction mere fancies of our own. The critic's ingenuity must not be mistaken for the Evangelist's practice. On the other hand, unless we can give to our theories regarding the use of sources some rational explanation of the writer's purpose and intention, our hypothesis remains precarious indeed. No writer worthy of the name will utilize sources at random; he will have a reason for what he does, even if his reasons are not always our reasons. He will value one source more highly than another; he will use one to fill up the deficiencies of another. The objection that we cannot be at all certain that we are thinking his thoughts after him is sound, but it may also very easily be over-pressed. Frequent and prolonged study of an author, especially when we look at his work

as a whole, comparing his practice in one case with another, and bearing in mind his characteristic ideas and literary habits, all this ought to save us from the perils of undue subjectivity. A self-consistent explanation of the use of sources, when effected in this way, confirms the arguments by which strata have been laid bare.

These, then, are the tests and the principles to be applied in our examination of St. Luke's use of Mk. They are objective as well as subjective. They are objective, because their application is controlled by facts, by the phenomena which present themselves in the Third Gospel when it is compared with Mk. They are subjective, because criticism is and always must be subjective, since of necessity it must be influenced and directed by the intelligence and the point of view of the critic. The corrective, where correction is needed, is supplied by time and by the work of other critics, for in the last resort criticism is a corporate task. The objection that Biblical Criticism is merely subjective is as false as it is childish : it is false because criticism does deal with facts ; it is childish because the objector, if he is to win a real victory, must interpret the same facts in another way, and he can do this only by being ' subjective ' in his criticism.

A final word needs to be added regarding the further procedure necessary when Markan and non-Markan strata are exposed. How shall we decide which is the principal source, the bedrock foundation of the whole? Detailed comparison alone can supply the material for the answer. We must, of course, be reasonably certain first that we have the right to speak of two sources, and not merely of one source and a number of fragments. If we can reach this point, then we may fairly and safely assume that if one source has unity, continuity, and comprehensiveness ; if its deficiencies are made good by what appear to be ' extracts ' from the other ; if the nature of its contents best explains omissions from the other ; if, in a word, the compiler appears to give to it his preference ; it is this source which is to be regarded as the framework of the final writing.

II

THE LUKAN PASSION AND RESURRECTION NARRATIVES

USING the principles described in Chapter I, we shall now try to distinguish Markan and non-Markan elements in the Lukan story of the Passion and Resurrection. We shall also inquire how far St. Luke has made use of Mk., and whether he has employed it as his principal source. In discussing this question it will be necessary to view the non-Markan material as a whole; to ask whether it consists of mere fragments, or whether it is derived from a continuous source, oral or written. In other words, has St. Luke inserted non-Markan matter into a Markan framework, or has he introduced Markan extracts into an independent and previously existing Passion narrative of his own?

The discussion really resolves itself into an examination of the literary relationship which exists between Lk. xxii.–xxiv. and Mk. xiv.–xvi. 8.[1] It will be best first of all to compare the several parallel narratives in these chapters, and then to review the Lukan material as a whole. This procedure will necessarily compel us to regard many of our conclusions in the first part of the inquiry as provisional. There will naturally be many cases where a final conclusion is possible only in the light of the whole.

[1] Mk. xvi. 9–20, the spurious conclusion of the canonical Mk., is, of course, left out of account. Cf. Swete, *St. Mk.*, pp. ciii. ff., and Gould, *I.C.C., St. Mk.*, pp. 301 ff.

§ 1. *Markan and Non-Markan Elements in the Narratives of Lk. xxii.–xxiv.*

The list of the separate narratives of Lk. xxii.–xxiv., together with the parallel sections in Mk., is as follows:

	Lk.	*Parallel in Mk.*
1. The Priests' Plot.	xxii. 1–2.	xiv. 1–2.
2. The Treachery of Judas.	3–6.	10–11.
3. Preparations for the Passover.	7–13.	12–16.
4. The Last Supper.	14–38.	17–25.
(*a*) Narr. of Institution.	14–20.	17, 22–5.
(*b*) Prediction of Betrayal.	21–3.	18–21.
(*c*) Discourse on True Greatness.	24–30.	x. 42–5.
(*d*) 'Simon, Simon' and Prediction of Denial.	31–4.	xiv. 27–31.
(*e*) Change of Methods.	35–8.	— —
5. The Agony in the Garden.	39–46.	26, 32–42.
6. Betrayal and Arrest.	47–54 a.	43–53.
7. Peter's Denial.	54 b–62.	54, 66–72.
8. The Mocking.	63–5.	65.
9. Trial before the Priests.	66–71.	55–64, xv. 1.
10. Trial before Pilate and Herod.	xxiii. 1–25.	xv. 1–15.
11. Simon of Cyrene and Journey to the Cross.	26–32.	20 b–21.
12. The Crucifixion.	33–49.	22–41.
13. The Burial.	50–4.	42–7.
14. Subsequent Action of the Women.	55–56 a.	— —
15. The Visit of the Women to the Tomb.	xxiii. 56 b–xxiv. 11.	xvi. 1–8.
16. The Appearance on the way to Emmaus; An Appearance to the Apostles; The Parting of Jesus from His disciples.	xxiv. 13–53.	— —

1. *The Priests' Plot.*
(Lk. xxii. 1–2, Mk. xiv. 1–2.)
2. *The Treachery of Judas.*
(Lk. xxii. 3–6, Mk. xiv. 10–11.)
3. *The Preparations for the Passover.*
(Lk. xxii. 7–13, Mk. xiv. 12–16.)

These three narratives can be taken together. There can be very little doubt that in each case St. Luke's source is Mk. In Lk. they appear in the same order as in Mk., the only difference being that Lk. omits the story of the Anointing at Bethany

(Mk. xiv. 3–9), probably because St. Luke had already told and preferred the similar story related in Lk. vii. 36–50.

Not only is there agreement in respect of order, the percentage of words in common with Mk. is also high. In the Priests' Plot it is 62·5; in the Treachery of Judas it is 45·4; and in the Preparations for the Passover 65·2. The lower percentage in the case of the second narrative is largely due to the additions which St. Luke has made to St. Mark's story. This will be seen from the fact that the percentage of words which Mk. has in common with Lk. is no less than 66·6. The additions are not such as to suggest a second source, and probably are sufficiently explained as editorial. Presumably the Markan narrative provoked reflection, with the result that Lk. xxii. 3–6 is St. Mark's story with annotations. Thus St. Luke adds the statement that Satan entered into Judas. He emphasizes the fact that Judas was 'of the number of' the Twelve, and he describes him as communing not only with the chief priests but also with 'the captains'. He stresses the consent of Judas and his intention to betray Jesus 'in the absence of the multitude'.

Similarly, there is no reason to think that in the story of the Preparations for the Passover St. Luke had any other source than Mk. Oral tradition may well account for the fact that he tells us that the two disciples sent were Peter and John. St. Luke's emphasis upon the necessity of sacrificing the Passover on the day of Unleavened Bread, and the fact that he puts the initiative into the hands of Jesus, only reveal his interest in the story in its bearing upon the Supper. This emphasis is the more interesting in view of the possibility, shortly to be considered, that St. Luke's earlier opinion did not support the idea that the Supper was the actual Passover meal. A convert to this opinion, he tells the story of the Preparation more pointedly than St. Mark himself.

4. *The Last Supper.*

(Lk. xxii. 14–38, Mk. xiv. 17–25.)

The account of the Supper in Lk., together with the incidents associated with it, is very much longer than the Markan story. Not only does Lk. include features which have no parallel in

Mk., but also the order of important incidents common to the two varies considerably, as will be seen from the table on page 34. The differences are sufficiently great to awaken doubt whether St. Luke is entirely dependent upon Mk. in this section. These doubts are strengthened when we note the percentage of words in common with Mk. Omitting the 'Western non-interpolation' in verses 19 b–20 from our calculation, we find that the percentage is only 21·7, and if further we omit the matter peculiar to Lk. in verses 28–30, 31–3, 35–8, we find that it rises to no more than 37·3. Having regard to the nature of the incidents described, this percentage cannot be called high, though high enough to suggest that Mk. has been used in some sense or other. How far this is true, and to what extent Mk. has been drawn upon, can only be determined by a detailed study of the several incidents and groups of sayings.

(a) *The Narrative of Institution.* (Lk. xxii. 14–20, Mk. xiv. 17, 22–5.)

Apart from verses 19 b–20, in this narrative of 89 words 34 (or 38·2 per cent.) are common to Mk.[1] This percentage is low, if we have regard to the fact that even independent narratives of the Supper might be expected to have a considerable number of words in common. The more remarkable feature, however, is the distribution of these words. No less than 26 of the 34 occur in the last two verses of the section (verses 18 and 19 a), while verses 14 to 17, which contain 54 words, have only 8 in common with Mk. It may well be questioned if verses 14 to 17 owe anything to Mk.; they may possibly belong to an independent account of the Supper. With these verses verse 18 is closely connected, and, although out of its 21 words 14 are common to Mk. xiv. 25, it is by no means certain that it is of Markan origin. It may easily be an independent rendering of the saying found in Mk., a view which is supported by the difference of wording at the end.[2]

[1] It is interesting to note that if we include Lk. xxii. 19 b-20 in the calculation, the percentage actually sinks to 36·3. This is due to the fact that the passage has only 31·2 per cent. of its words in common with Mk. The percentage in common with 1 Cor. xi. 24 f. is 81·2.

[2] Lk. ends with the words, 'until the kingdom of God shall come'. Cf. Mk.—'until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God'.

On the other hand, the Markan origin of verse 19 a is unquestionable. Of its 14 words 12 agree exactly with Mk. xiv. 22. The chief variation is the use of εὐχαριστήσας instead of εὐλογήσας as in Mk., which is probably explained by the previous use of εὐχαριστήσας in verse 17. Thus, so far as the linguistic phenomena are concerned, the Lukan account of the institution of the Supper would seem to rest upon *a non-Markan source, as found in verses 14–18, to which verse 19 a has been added from St. Mark's Gospel.* It may be that verse 18 is also Markan, but in view of its close connexion with verses 14–17 this is very much less certain. At this stage we can only regard such a theory as provisional; it requires to be supported by more material considerations if it is to stand. I believe that these can be found if the substance of St. Luke's narrative is compared with Mk. xiv. 17, 22–5.

(1) In the first place, there is reason to think that the Lukan story belongs to a source which did not identify the Supper with the actual Passover meal. In St. Luke's narrative Jesus is said to have sat down with the Apostles 'when the hour was come'. It is usual to associate this 'hour' with the evening of the Passover. But this identification is due to the influence of the passage xxii. 1–13, which, as we have seen, is taken from Mk. If, as we suspect, xxii. 14 ff. is drawn from a source independent of Mk., we ought to regard this explanation as an open question. As the Third Gospel now stands, the occasion of the Supper is without doubt the Passover evening; but is this the case if we examine xxii. 14 ff. apart from xxii. 1–13? To say the least, it is very doubtful. In the Lukan story, either during the meal or immediately before, Jesus says: 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' The meaning of these words can hardly be other than that Jesus does not expect to be alive by the Passover evening. He has very strongly desired to keep the feast with His followers, but this will not be possible.[1]

(2) In the second place, the point of view from which the Lukan narrative contemplates the Supper, while not opposed to

[1] This opinion has been independently reached by several scholars. Cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 545.

that of Mk., is quite distinctive. It is impossible to read the Lukan story without receiving the impression of something especially solemn and mysterious. Jesus knows that He will not partake of the fruit of the vine again until the Banquet of the Messianic Kingdom. Before another Passover on earth He will have suffered. Under these circumstances, the sharing of the Cup has a meaning it could never have had before. It is a solemn pledge of undying love, a new Passover, anticipatory of the Messianic Feast. Because the Cup only is mentioned,[1] we are not to suppose that the significance of the Supper consists in this alone; it is the entire meal that is fraught with solemn meaning. Jesus clearly intended this Last Supper to be the pledge of a communion never to be broken. It would, I think, be a feeble example of historical criticism to regard the narrative of Lk. xxii. 14–18 as a complete account of the Supper, and to conclude that the words, 'This is my body', 'This is my blood', as given by Mk., are unhistorical. 1 Cor. xi. 23–5 is the earliest reference to the Supper we possess, and in this passage these symbolic words of Jesus are given substantially as in Mk. But if Lk. xxii. 14–18 is not a complete account of the Supper, it is undoubtedly a literary unity, and in relation to it verse 19a, which gives the Markan saying regarding the Bread, bears every appearance of being a later addition from a different story.

(3) It should further be noticed how awkwardly verse 19a follows after verses 14–18; it breaks the excellent connexion which otherwise exists between this passage and the reference to the traitor in verse 21. As it now stands, the passage xxii. 14–23 is a patchwork, such as we can never suppose to have left St. Luke's hand at one and the same time. Verse 19a looks almost like a foot-note thrust into the text, with the result that verse 21 throws up a sharp edge. For, with the omission of verses 19b–20, it is necessary to suppose, on the commonly accepted theory of the composition of the Gospel, that St. Luke

[1] The *Didache* gives the order, first Cup then Bread. This would be confirmatory evidence that *both* stood in the non-Markan source, and in this order, if a clearer case could be found in the literary evidence. Has Lk. xxii. 19a replaced a reference in the non-Markan source to the Bread, or is this verse (for all the closeness of its language to Mk. xiv. 22) non-Markan? Of these alternatives the second seems impossible, while the first is speculative.

meant the words, 'This is my body', to be followed immediately by the cry: 'But behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.' How much better is the connexion of these words with verses 14–18! The thought of the Supper as anticipatory of the Messianic Feast is dramatically broken by the remembrance of the presence of the traitor.

(4) Finally, it should be observed that the theory under discussion gives a rational explanation of Lk. xxii. 14–20 as a whole. This will appear if we consider what (on this theory) the Evangelist's procedure must have been. The non-Markan source included verses 14–18 and was followed immediately by verse 21. As such, its account of the Supper, while coherent and impressive, was obviously incomplete. Hence it is that to xxii. 14–18 St. Luke has added from Mk. the saying regarding the Bread in 19 a. In so doing, he has deliberately sacrificed the literary completeness of his earlier version, making art subservient to truth as he conceived it to be. Why he did not continue to add the Markan description of the Cup, and the saying regarding the fruit of the vine in Mk. xiv. 25, is clear. Lk. xxii. 14–18 already contained parallels to these matters, although, it is true, the words, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves', lack the pregnant saying, 'This is my blood'. The principal deficiency of xxii. 14–18 was its ambiguous reference to the eating of bread, and this is supplied from Mk. by the Evangelist in verse 19 a. The interpolation in xxii. 19 b–20 represents a further stage which St. Luke himself did not take. Here the saying, 'This is my blood', is expanded under the influence of 1 Cor. xi. 24 f., and the saying regarding the Cup is taken from the same passage, with the result that in the T.R. of Lk. xxii. 14–20 we get a curious amalgam in which two cups are mentioned and two very different accounts of the Supper stand side by side.

Besides leading the Evangelist to expand his non-Markan account of the Supper, the Markan version appears to have moved St. Luke to depart from his earlier view regarding the time of the Supper. In Mk. the Supper is plainly held on the evening of the Passover, although, as it has often been urged, there are indications in the Markan story itself that historically this view is not correct. The present is not the only occasion in

which, for all his historical insight, St. Luke has deferred to a later and less valuable opinion. That he did come to look upon the Supper as the actual Passover meal is evident from xxii. 1–13. Here, in verses 7–13, we have the Markan story of the Preparations for the Passover, while in verse 1 it is expressly said, 'Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover'.

It appears then, that several lines of argument converge on the theory that xxii. 19 a is St. Luke's Markan addition to a non-Markan account of the Supper contained in xxii. 14–18. In spite of these arguments, however, the conclusion must remain provisional, unless elsewhere in the Gospel we can find frequent examples which point to the same procedure. To feel full confidence in our results, it is also necessary to be able to view Lk. xxii. 14–18 as part of a continuous non-Markan source. It will be found that these conditions arise in the case of all the individual sections we are at present considering.

(b) *The Prediction of the Betrayal.* (Lk. xxii. 21–3, Mk. xiv. 18–21.)

As will be seen from the table on page 34, the two Gospels differ in the placing of this incident, Mk. putting it before and Lk. after the account of the institution of the Supper. Of the 46 words in Lk. xxii. 21–3 there are 18 common to Mk. More significant is the distribution of these words: verse 21 has 4 of them, and verse 23 but one; on the other hand, verse 22 has no less than 13 of its 18 words common to Mk. A careful study of this intervening verse suggests that it is a Markan addition to verses 21, 23, which apparently are of independent origin.

A comparison between verse 22 and Mk. xiv. 21 a reveals a very striking similarity.

Lk. xxii. 22.	*Mk. xiv. 21 a.*
For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed.	For the Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him: but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed.

The Markan origin of Lk. xxii. 22 is hardly open to question,

but can we view this verse as an insertion into the passage Lk. xxii. 21, 23: 'But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing'? The language of these verses has practically nothing in common with Mk., and, as we see, the connexion between the two verses is an excellent one. It should be noted that even in Mk. the description of the effect upon the disciples of Christ's words regarding treachery follows immediately on His declaration, 'One of you shall betray me', while the saying regarding the fate of the traitor comes later. Apparently St. Luke has separated verses 21 and 23 in order to bring together Christ's words regarding the traitor, and there is much to be said for the view that verse 22 represents a second and Markan stratum in an otherwise independent narrative. We lack, however, the more solid grounds which in other cases are forthcoming, for making a confident decision.

(c) *The Discourse on True Greatness, and the Saying about Twelve Thrones.* (Lk. xxii. 24–30, Mk. x. 42–5.)

The saying about Twelve Thrones (Lk. xxii. 28–30 = Mt. xix. 28) has no parallel in Mk., but is possibly derived from Q. The Discourse on True Greatness in Lk. xxii. 24–7 has a number of verbal similarities in common with Mk. x. 42–5, which belongs to the story of the ambitious request of James and John. Of the 67 words of Lk. xxii. 24–7 there are 21 in common with the Markan passage, and, while this is not a high proportion, the question must be faced whether St. Luke's source is not Mk. A close comparison of the two passages will show that verses 24, 26b, 27 owe little, if anything, to Mk.; the real problem concerns verses 25–26a, which out of 20 words share 15 with Mk.

Lk. xxii. 25–26 a.	*Mk. x. 42–43 a.*
And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so.	And Jesus . . . saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you.

In addition to the verbal similarity, the good connexion between verse 26b and verse 24 should be noticed.[1]

On the other hand, as against the theory that Lk. xxii. 25–26a has been taken from Mk., we have to remember that the two passages may well be independent renderings of the same saying. When, moreover, we note the difference of time and circumstance, this possibility is strengthened. It is not easy to think that St. Luke would cut a passage from a different narrative, and thrust it into an entirely new context. Such at least does not appear to have been his habit where Mk. is concerned. Every case where we have reason to think that St. Luke has inserted a Markan passage into a non-Markan context is a case of parallel versions of the same incident. That xxii. 25–26a may be a Markan borrowing is possible then; but it is not very probable. In the main Lk. xxii. 24–30 is independent of Mk., and this is probably true of the passage as a whole.

(d) *Christ's words to Simon and the Prediction of the Denial.* (Lk. xxii. 31–4, Mk. xiv. 27–31.)

The only parallel which Lk. has with Mk. is in the Prediction itself and the reference to cock-crowing. In verses 31–3 Lk. has none of the characteristic details of St. Mark's narrative,[2] while the words, 'Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death', are very different in form from the saying in Mk., 'If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee'. It is clear that verses 31–3, which have but three words in common with Mk., rest upon a non-Markan source.

This view is much less certain as regards the Prediction itself (verse 34). This verse is in close agreement with Mk. xiv. 30, though the possibility of independent origin is not excluded.[3]

Mk. xiv. 30.	*Lk. xxii. 34.*
And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that thou to-day, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice.	And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.

[1] Verse 26b, in its reference to ὁ μείζων, takes up the very point raised in the question of verse 24 (τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων).

[2] Thus Lk. has no parallel to the saying about smiting the shepherd, to the prophecy of Christ's Appearance in Galilee, to Peter's words, 'Although all shall be offended, yet will not I', and to the later statement regarding the other disciples, 'And in like manner also said they all'.

[3] Of the fifteen words in verse 34 there are eight common to Mk. xiv. 30.

The fact that the occasion is differently placed points to the independence of the Lukan passage as a whole, but tells less strongly against the view that verse 34 is a Markan addition; for if St. Luke desired to add this prediction, the conversation of xxii. 31–3 was obviously the place to make the addition. That verse 34 is a Markan addition is supported by the manifest unity of xxii. 31–3, by the fact that in this passage the disciple is addressed as Simon, whereas in verse 34 he is called Peter, and finally by the probability, yet to be discussed, that the story of the Denial (xxii. 54b–62) is also Markan.

(e) *The Conversation on the Change of Methods.* (Lk. xxii. 35–8.)

This section of seventy-nine words is peculiar to St. Luke's account of the Supper. The references to 'purse', 'wallet', and 'shoes' point back to Lk. x. 4, where these articles are mentioned in precisely the same order. In view of the fact that the Missionary Address of Lk. x. is given to the 'Seventy', the question is raised whether in Lk. xxii. 35–8 we have not some indication that more of Christ's followers than the Twelve were present at the Supper, a point which bears on the use of the term 'apostles' in Lk. xxii. 14. The saying, 'this which is written must be fulfilled in me', is important as providing a link between the present passage and other non-Markan portions of Lk. (e. g. Lk. xxiv. 26 f., 44 ff.).

We may summarize the discussion so far as it concerns Lk. xxiv. 14–38 by saying that there is good reason to think of the Lukan account of the Supper as substantially independent of Mk., and probably earlier than Mk. Apparently the Evangelist himself has subsequently added Markan extracts in xxii. 19a, 22, and 34; verses 19b and 20 being the further addition of a later and unknown interpolator.

5. *The Agony in the Garden.*

(Lk. xxii. 39–46, Mk. xiv. 26, 32–8.)

The number of words which Lk. shares with Mk. in this incident is 30 out of 115 (26 per cent.). If we exclude verse

43 f. (The Agony and Bloody Sweat), which is absent from important MSS., the percentage rises to 34. It is not at all certain, however, that we ought to exclude these words, for their omission by copyists is more easy to understand than their interpolation. If they are absent from B, the Egyptian versions, W, and the Sinaitic Syriac, they appear in the first hand of ℵ, in L, in almost all manuscripts of the Old Latin version, and in the Curetonian Syriac.[1] In any case, having regard to the nature of the story, the percentage must be considered low. The only continuous passage in common with Mk. is found in the closing words: 'pray, that ye enter not into temptation' (verse 46b). Inasmuch as already in verse 40 Lk. has 'Pray that ye enter not into temptation', it is difficult to say whether verse 46b ought to be regarded as a later addition or not. As regards the rest of the narrative one can speak much more positively. A comparison of the Lukan and Markan stories as a whole strongly supports the independence of Lk. Thus, in Lk. we have no reference to the name 'Gethsemane'; the scene is described, as in Jn. xviii. 2, as 'the place', *τόπος* (Mk. has *χωρίον*). St. Luke makes no reference to the separation of Peter, James, and John from the rest; he does not speak of Jesus being 'greatly amazed' and 'sore troubled'; nor does he give the striking saying, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death'. In Lk. Jesus is parted from His disciples by a stone's cast; in Mk. He first separates the three from the rest, and then goes forward a little. In Mk. He falls to the ground; in Lk. He kneels. Apart from the words, 'remove this cup from me', the two versions of Christ's prayer vary widely in phraseology. In Lk. Jesus addresses all the disciples; in Mk. Peter and then the rest. To the remainder of the Markan story Lk. has no parallel—the reproach to Peter; the saying 'the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak'; the threefold prayer and the threefold discovery of the disciples sleeping; the saying, 'it is enough; the hour is come'; the words about the approach of the traitor. Individually, some of these differences are slight, and no one would lay much stress upon them; but, considered together, they are so many as to leave little doubt in the mind that St. Luke's

[1] A full discussion of the passage is given by Plummer, *I.C.C., St. Lk.*, p. 544, and more recently by Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 137 ff.

version is independent of Mk. The only doubtful point is whether xxii. 46b is a Markan pendant.

6. *The Betrayal and Arrest.*

(Lk. xxii. 47–54a, Mk. xiv. 43–53.)

Of the 135 words in this section 56 (or 41·4 per cent.) are common to Mk. This percentage is higher than any we have yet found, but inasmuch as nearly half of the words common to Mk. occur in xxii. 52 f., analogy, based on other instances in the Passion narrative, leads us to consider whether we have not yet another example of a non-Markan source which has received a Markan addition.

There are no less than ten words common to Mk. in the opening passage in verse 47a.[1] In spite of this, however, dependence on Mk. is not certain. The agreement with Mk. in the phrase ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος can hardly be thought significant, in view of St. Luke's not infrequent use of ἔτι with the participle in the genitive absolute.[2] Further, the greater emphasis upon the name of Judas ('He that was called Judas') is explained if the present section is non-Markan, inasmuch as this is the first reference to Judas in xxii. 14 ff. There are also other differences from Mk.; thus, in Lk. the multitude is mentioned first; there is no reference to 'swords and staves', nor to the statement that the crowd came 'from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders'. More vital differences emerge as the narrative proceeds. Thus St. Luke tells us nothing of a sign arranged by Judas, nor does he tell us that Judas actually kissed Jesus, though the latter is probably implied in the words of Jesus, peculiar to Lk., in verse 48—'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?'

Striking differences are also manifest in the incident connected with the servant of the high priest. In this story there is much that is peculiar to Lk., and it is perhaps significant that the one detail which presents the closest parallel with the Markan narrative—the cutting off of the servant's ear—is discordant with what

[1] 'While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them.'

[2] Lk. (6), Mk. (2), Mt. (3), Jn. (0), Acts (1).

is peculiar in St. Luke's account. St. Luke tells us that Jesus touched the ear and healed the man, a treatment which seems strange indeed in the case of a severed ear. The theory is at least suggested that the Lukan story originally spoke of a wounded, or even a bruised right ear, and that the reference to the severed ear is a Markan insertion.[1] This would explain the difficulties of the Lukan story, and also the fact that in Mk. there is no reference to healing. That more than one account of this incident existed is suggested perhaps by the considerably fuller story in Mt. xxvi. 51–5. It is certainly interesting to observe that the words of Jesus in Mt. xxvi. 52, 'Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword', supply the answer to the question of Lk. xxii. 49, 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?', a question which Mt. does not record.

As regards the next portion of the story in verses 52–3, it is probable that here much has been added from Mk. According to verse 52 Jesus addresses 'the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders, which were come against him', and His words, as given by Lk., agree closely with Mk. ('Are ye come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves? When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched not forth your hands against me'). As supporting the view that the passage just quoted (Lk. xxii. 52–3 a) is a Markan insertion, the following points are worthy of notice:

(1) No previous reference has been made in the Lukan narrative to the presence of the chief priests and elders.

(2) Twenty-six words out of thirty-eight in this passage (68·4 per cent.) are common to Mk. xiv. 43–52.

(3) The passage seems artificially constructed on the basis of Mk. xiv. 48 f. together with the opening verse (43) in the Markan story, the latter having supplied the reference to the chief priests and elders, as well as the verb *παραγίνομαι*. On this view, we have to suppose that St. Luke failed to

[1] Cf. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, pp. 127 ff.: 'A scrutiny of Lk.'s version will, I think, lead to the conclusion that he is utilizing at least two sources, and that the evidence of these two sources conflicts. . . . It . . . looks as though Lk. had conflated two traditions; (1) that of Mk., which simply records that the man's ear was cut off, and (2) a tradition which tells of the healing of the ear which had been wounded by a stroke with a sword.'

notice that the priests are not actually present. If we refuse to allow this, we are left with the much greater difficulty of explaining the presence of these men at the Arrest. The presence of the 'captains of the temple' is not open to the same objection, and it may be that in the non-Markan source Jesus addressed these men with the words, 'This is your hour, and the power of darkness' (xxii. 53 b).

On the assumption of the existence of a non-Markan source, along the lines suggested above, it is interesting to consider what must have been its drift. Apparently, the source told of the approach of a crowd preceded by Judas. Judas drew near to kiss Jesus, but before he could do so Jesus addressed the traitor with the words, 'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?' Seeing that the arrest of Jesus was imminent, the disciples cried, 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?', and one of them wounded the high priest's servant on the ear. So far from encouraging His followers in their violence, Jesus healed the man. He then surrendered Himself to the captains of the temple, saying, 'This is your hour, and the power of darkness'.

It must be allowed that the story as thus reconstructed has much probability. Throughout, the attitude of Jesus is consistent with the best that we know of Him. His words to Judas breathe the sadness of a deeply wounded love. So far from approving of the violence of His followers, He ministers to His enemies, while instead of the remark about the occasion of the arrest, as given in Mk. (xiv. 48–9), with its otiose suggestion that its circumstances have fallen out to the fulfilment of Scripture, we have the dignity of a surrender to all that is involved in the hour of His enemies and the power of darkness (cf. John xviii. 11).

As a tentative conclusion, then, we suggest that Lk. xxii. 47–54 a is based on a non-Markan source, which has received Markan additions in xxii. 50 b ('and struck off his right ear') and in xxii. 52–3 a.

7. *Peter's Denial.*

(Lk. xxii. 54 b–61, Mk. xiv. 54, 66–72.)

This incident is distinguished from any we have yet considered in Lk. xxii. 14 ff. by the fact that it has no less than half its words in common with Mk. This fact, together with other arguments to be considered, renders it probable that St. Luke took over the story from Mk. If we ask why, in this case, the percentage is not even greater than it is, an important part of the answer lies in the fact that the narrative includes three very similar questions addressed to Peter and three similar answers. It is hardly to be wondered at that in reproducing the story there should be a considerable amount of variation in the wording of these questions and answers. Not only is the percentage significant; the even distribution of the words in common points in the same direction. There is not, as in previous instances, a massing of 'common words' in a few verses of the narrative. It is true that the position of the Denial in Lk. differs from that which it has in Mk., where it follows the story of the Trial before the High Priest. This fact is important when we consider the Lukan account of the Trial, which in that Gospel takes place on the following morning. It has no bearing on the narrative of the Denial, which in both Gospels is placed on the evening of the Arrest. If, as we shall find, the Lukan story of the Trial is independent of the parallel story in Mk., St. Luke was compelled to introduce the account of the Denial just where he places it.

Turning now to the substance of the narrative, we may note the presence in both Gospels of features which suggest dependence. Among these may be mentioned the reference to Peter following 'from afar', the phrase *πρὸς τὸ φῶς*, the reference to Peter's Galilean origin, and especially the passage *καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος . . . ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ . . . ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι . . . ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς*. The variations in St. Luke's narrative can in most cases be adequately explained either as inferences from Mk. or as editorial modifications.

As instances of the former may be mentioned St. Luke's reference to the lighting of the fire (xxii. 55), and the reference to the interval of 'about one hour' before the final challenge. As instances of

editorial modification, we may note the absence of the reference to the departure of Peter to the porch after the first challenge, the substitution of a different speaker (a man) in the second challenge, the omission of the references to cursing and swearing and to *two* cock-crowings, and finally the avoidance of St. Mark's difficult closing phrase *καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν*.

The only important addition in the Lukan story is the statement, 'And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter', and this is easily explained as an interesting detail supplied by oral tradition. There is no ground for supposing the existence of any documentary source other than Mk.

8. *The Mocking.*

(Lk. xxii. 63–5, Mk. xiv. 65.)

In this incident Lk. has only six (or four) words out of twenty-seven in common with Mk., but this is perhaps the least reason for asserting the independence of the Lukan narrative. St. Mark's story is closely connected with the account of the Trial; indeed, in Mk. the men who insult Jesus are present in the court, and are expressly distinguished from the 'officers' who 'received him with blows'. In Lk. the Mocking precedes the Trial and probably follows hard on the removal from the Garden to the high priest's house, while those who mock Jesus are 'the men that held him', presumably those who had effected the arrest. St. Luke, moreover, has no reference to spitting, and speaks of beating rather than buffeting. If, as Streeter contends, the original Markan text lacked the words 'and to cover his face',[1] the reference to blindfolding is peculiar to Lk., with the result that the two versions are entirely different. 'In Mark the mockers spit on His face and slap Him and cry, "Play the prophet now!". In Luke they veil His eyes and then, striking Him, say, "Use your prophetic gift of second sight to tell the striker's name". Each version paints a consistent picture . . .'

[1] In Mk. the words *καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον* are omitted in D, a, f, *τῷ προσώπῳ* being substituted for *αὐτῷ*. Syr. Sin. also omits the words (with 'his cheeks' for 'him'), and Streeter holds that originally Θ, 565, Arm. agreed with D, a, f. Cf. *The Four Gospels*, p. 326.

(*The Four Gospels*, p. 327).[1] The closing sentence ('And many other things spake they against him, reviling him') has no parallel in Mk. In this story, if anywhere, St. Luke is following a tradition which owes nothing whatever to St. Mark.

An interesting point arises in Lk. xxii. 63. The Revised Version reads, 'And the men that held *Jesus*', but this is not a translation, as the margin indicates. In the Greek there is no word for 'Jesus'; the pronoun 'him' is used. The Revised Version gives the sense of the pronoun, and this is required in view of the story of Peter. But why has Lk. αὐτόν and not Ἰησοῦν? If the Denial is a later insertion the reason is plain. In the non-Markan source Ἰησοῦν was not necessary, since Lk. xxii. 63 followed immediately after Lk. xxii. 54a. The entire passage read as follows: 'And they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house. And the men that held him mocked him, and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy: who is he that struck thee? And many other things spake they against him, reviling him.' The reiterated 'him' is surely intentional. Here we have undoubtedly a dramatic passage which the subsequent insertion of the Markan story of the Denial has veiled.

9. *The Trial before the Priests.*

(Lk. xxii. 66–71, Mk. xiv. 55–64.)

The percentage of words in common with Mk. (35·1) in this narrative is small, and gives little ground for thinking that Mk. is St. Luke's source. Moreover, of the thirty-three words which the two narratives have in common the majority are of little or no importance in their bearing on the question of dependence. The only words of moment in this connexion are in verses 69 and 71.

At first sight Lk. xxii. 69[2] does seem to depend on Mk. xiv. 62.[3] The Lukan passage is much less objective than its Markan

[1] The independence of St. Luke's narrative is still more manifest if the question 'Who is he that struck thee?' is an interpolation in Mt. from Lk. Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 326 f.

[2] 'But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.'

[3] '. . . and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.'

counterpart. Instead of saying that priests and scribes will see the Son of man seated on high and coming with the clouds of heaven, St. Luke simply states the fact of the session on high; he has nothing corresponding to 'and coming with the clouds of heaven'. Again, the phrase 'power' is in Lk. defined as 'the power of God'. Thus the passage could be regarded as an editorial adaptation of Mk. But closer study tends to show that its form is due less to the editorial use of Mk. than to the drift of the Lukan story as a whole. In Lk. the charge, 'If thou art the Christ, tell us', is answered by the words, 'If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer', and it is perfectly in keeping with so cryptic an utterance that it should be followed by the statement, 'But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God'. Not only so, it will be seen that this statement provokes at once the question which follows in Lk.: 'And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God?' Thus the Lukan story has a unity of its own, which itself accounts for the form of verse 69. It would be artificial in the extreme to hold that this verse has first received its literary form as an editorial modification of Mk. xiv. 62, and then has become the pivot on which another version of the Markan story turns.

A similar conclusion should probably be drawn in the case of verse 71. In Lk. the question 'What further need have we of witness?' is asked by all; whereas in Mk. the similar question of xiv. 63 is put by the high priest only. There is no specific reference, as in Mk., to blasphemy. 'We ourselves have heard', cry the priests, 'from his own mouth.'

So far we have left out of account the most obvious difference between the two narratives, the difference in respect of time. As is well known, St. Mark's story describes a trial by night, while St. Luke's version is that of a trial by day. This is not the place to discuss which of these versions is to be preferred. All that need be said here is that so great a variation as this is an added reason for denying that Mk. is St. Luke's source in the Trial narrative.

10. *The Trial before Pilate and Herod.*

(Lk. xxiii. 1–25, Mk. xv. 1–15. Trial before Herod, Lk. xxiii. 6–16.)

A detailed comparison of the Lukan account of the Trial before Pilate with Mk. xv. 1–15 leaves little room for doubt that the two narratives are of independent origin. Of the 372 words of Lk. xxiii. 1–25 only 51 (or 13·7 per cent.) are common to Mk. xv. 1–15, and if we omit from the comparison the Lukan account of the Trial by Herod (verses 6 to 16), the percentage only rises to 26·5. Moreover, of the 51 words common to Lk. and Mk., 27 are accounted for by proper names, the verb 'to crucify', and instances of the use of δέ and the definite article. It is interesting to observe that no less than 16 of the words in common occur in a single verse (Lk. xxiii. 3), a fact which raises the question whether this verse may not be a Markan addition. The passage is as follows: 'And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest.' The verse is preceded by the threefold accusation of the priests, and is followed by the declaration of Pilate, 'I find no fault in this man'. The objection to regarding the passage as a Markan addition is that, in this case, St. Luke's original account passes abruptly from the accusation of the priests to Pilate's assertion of the Prisoner's innocence, with no account of any examination intervening. On the other hand, this objection may be countered by the suggestion that St. Luke had no information about the facts of the examination, and for this reason was glad to take over into his own narrative the question and answer of xxiii. 3 from St. Mark's Gospel (xv. 2). In support of this argument, it may be noted that nowhere else in the Lukan account have we any additional information regarding the examination of Jesus by Pilate; the narrative deals with circumstances attending the Trial rather than with the Trial itself. Further, xxiii. 3 touches only one of the points raised in the accusation (xxiii. 2); it says nothing of the charges of perverting the nation and of forbidding the payment of tribute to Caesar. It is quite possible that St. Luke may have drawn the substance of xxiii. 3 from oral tradition, but the curious clustering of words common to Mk. xv. 2 in this one

verse of a narrative which contains so few, together with the further considerations raised above, points to the Evangelist's use of Mk. No other verse in the Lukan story has even the claim of xxiii. 3 to Markan parentage.

This opinion is considerably strengthened when we turn to the broader treatment of the two narratives. Even more clearly than St. Mark has St. Luke perceived that the responsibility for the condemnation of Jesus lay with the chief priests and scribes. The people are mentioned, but play little part in the unfolding of the drama. In Mk. it is the crowd which approaches Pilate and reminds him of the custom of the feast, and it is the crowd which, under the instigation of the chief priests, cries out for the release of Barabbas. In Lk. we learn nothing of this distinction. There priests, rulers, and people greet Pilate's proffered clemency with the words, 'Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas'. It is only now that St. Luke tells us who Barabbas was. How deep was the impression made upon his mind by this amazing choice is strikingly shown in his closing words: 'And he released him that for insurrection and murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will.'

The most obvious contrast in the two narratives is in the portraiture of Pilate. St. Luke's sympathy with the Roman governor is manifest. Three times Pilate pointedly affirms the innocence of Jesus; every attempt is made to save his Prisoner, and when he yields it is only because further resistance means danger to himself. Nowhere in St. Luke's narrative have we any sign of the vacillating spirit which in Mk. asks, 'What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews?' St. Luke would have been incapable of penning such a sentence as Mk. xv. 15, 'And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas'. Impossible as it is for him to conceal the governor's action in submitting to clamour, St. Luke succeeds in showing where the greater crime lay: 'And Pilate gave sentence, that what they asked for should be done.'

Although the incident of the Trial by Herod has no parallel in Mk., it cannot be passed by in comparing the Lukan narrative with that of Mk. For it cannot be omitted from St. Luke's

story. How closely it is fused with the rest of the account is reflected in the different statements, given in commentaries, as to where it begins and where it ends. Lk. xxiii. 1–25, in other words, is a literary unity. There has been no piecing together of Markan material with the story of Herod. All is done at a stroke. The only question is whether a single Markan touch does not appear in Lk. xxiii. 3. In this connexion reference may be made to the absence of any parallel in Lk. to the reviling of Jesus by Roman soldiers. Its absence is sufficiently explained by the fact that it was alien to the drift of the non-Markan source which we have found abundant reason to postulate. This source knew nothing of the purple robe and the crown of thorns, nothing of the scourging and reviling of Jesus by Gentiles. It told rather of the mocking of Jesus by His Jewish captors, and of the rough horse-play of Herod's soldiery. It is the conscious preference for this source which explains St. Luke's failure to include any parallel to Mk. xv. 16–20 a.

11. *The Story of Simon of Cyrene and of the Journey to the Cross.*

(Lk. xxiii. 26–32, Mk. xv. 20 b–21.)

In this section of 109 words Lk. shares 14 only with Mk. Verses 27–32, which record Christ's words to the weeping women of Jerusalem, are peculiar to Lk.; thus the only question is whether xxiii. 26 is Markan. Now in this verse of 19 words 11 are common to Mk. xv. 20 b–21, and a comparison of the two passages gives much support to the view that St. Luke's source is Mk.

Mk. xv. 20 b–21.	*Lk. xxiii. 26.*
And they lead him out to crucify him.	And when they led him away,
And they compel one passing by,	they laid hold upon one
Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country,	Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country,
the father of Alexander and Rufus,	
to go with them, that he might bear his cross.	and laid on him the cross, to bear it after Jesus.

In comparing these passages in the Greek, the following points should be noticed:

(1) The opening words are very similar, and by the aid of a participial construction (ἐπιλαβόμενοι) two sentences in Mk. are apparently in Lk. reduced to one.

(2) St. Luke's habit when giving proper names is to use some form of the noun ὄνομα. This is not the case in xxiii. 26 (Σίμωνά τινα).

(3) The agreement in the use of the phrase 'coming from the country' is striking.

On the other side, it has to be remembered that the presence of this incident in Lk. may be due to the influence of oral tradition. Both Mt. and Lk. agree in using ἀπήγαγον (Mk. ἐξάγουσιν), though in the case of Lk. there is a strongly supported alternative reading (ἀπῆγον). Further, Lk. has ἐπιλαβόμενοι instead of the pictorial word ἀγγαρεύουσιν (Mk.), while the close of the sentence in Lk. (φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) varies both in form and in meaning from Mk. (ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ).

The balance of the argument is in favour of regarding Lk. xxiii. 26 as a Markan addition, but it is not strong enough to remove an element of doubt.

12. *The Crucifixion.*

(Lk. xxiii. 33–49, Mk. xv. 22–41.)

Similar features to those we have had occasion to note again and again reappear in St. Luke's Crucifixion narrative. Of its 265 words only 76 (or 28·6 per cent.) are common to Mk. Moreover, again we have the same curious feature in respect of their distribution. Nearly a quarter of the words in common occur in two successive verses (xxiii. 44 f.).

Among the features of the Markan story which have no parallel in Lk., the following may be noted:

(1) The name 'Golgotha'.

(2) The statement that wine was offered to and rejected by Jesus.

(3) The statement regarding the time of the Crucifixion. 'And it was the third hour, and they crucified him' (Mk. xv. 25).

(4) The reference to the railing of those who passed by, who wagged their heads (Ps. xxii. 7) and said, 'Ha! thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross' (Mk. xv. 29 f.).

(5) Part of the words of the chief priests (Lk. 'the rulers'): '. . . Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe' (Mk. xv. 32).

(6) The statement that those who were crucified with him (i.e. both) reproached him (Mk. xv. 32).

(7) The cry of Jesus, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani' (Mk. xv. 34).

(8) The statement that the bystanders supposed that Jesus called for Elijah: 'Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down' (Mk. xv. 36).

A similar list may be given of the features which are peculiar to St. Luke's narrative of the Crucifixion.

(1) The word 'malefactors', κακοῦργοι (Lk. xxiii. 32, 33).

(2) If it is not an interpolation in Lk., the prayer, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Lk. xxiii. 34). (Cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 138 f.)

(3) The words, 'And the people stood beholding' (Lk. xxiii. 35).

(4) The phrase 'his chosen', used of Christ by the rulers (Lk. xxiii. 35).

(5) The statement that the soldiers mocked Jesus, offering Him vinegar (cf. Mk. xv. 36, 'And one ran . . .') and crying, 'If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself' (Lk. xxiii. 36 f.).

(6) The story of the Penitent Thief, including the words of his companion, 'Art not thou the Christ? save thyself and us' (Lk. xxiii. 39–43).

(7) The bringing together of the Miraculous Darkness and the Rending of the Temple Veil (Lk. xxiii. 44 f.). In Mk. (xv. 38) the latter stands at the end of the section after the reference to the death of Jesus.

(8) The phrase 'the sun's light failing' (Lk. xxiii. 45).

(9) The words of the centurion, 'Certainly this was a righteous man' (Lk. xxiii. 47). Cf. Mk. (xv. 39), 'Truly this man was the Son of God'.

When the differences between the two narratives are considered along with the small amount of verbal parallelism, there appears to be good ground for asserting the independence of the two versions. This conclusion is considerably strengthened when the uneven distribution of the words in common with Mk. is studied, for in several cases these are found in passages which have the appearance of separate and later strata.

(1) It is difficult to say whether we ought to regard Lk. xxiii. 34 b as a Markan insertion ('*And parting his garments among*

them, they cast lots'). For, although out of the seven Greek words six agree with Mk. xv. 24 b, the passage is a quotation from Ps. xxii. 18, and may owe its place in St. Luke's narrative to independent oral tradition. On the other hand, the quotation comes in rather abruptly in the Lukan story.

(2) There is more to be said for the suggestion that Lk. xxiii. 38 is a Markan insertion ('*And there was also a superscription over him, This is the King of the Jews*'). This verse is very loosely connected with the Lukan story. It does not stand, as in Mk., at the beginning, but slips in as a kind of afterthought, suggested by the soldiers' taunt, 'If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself'. Moreover, the verse interrupts what appears to be a deliberately constructed sequence in St. Luke's narrative. St. Luke seems to have been deeply impressed by the contrast between the figure of Jesus and all who in any way were associated with Him in the Crucifixion Story. One by one he names the different classes and types of persons present and describes their words and comments. This picture begins in xxiii. 35, where, with a few strokes of the pen, we are made to see a vast silent crowd in the words, 'And the people stood beholding'. It is noticeable that here and throughout the Crucifixion scene the people are silent, until at the very end we see them returning, smiting their breasts. Stunned and bewildered, they present a sharp contrast to the rulers, the soldiers, and the malefactors, whose words one by one the Evangelist records. First, in xxiii. 35 b, we have the reference to the rulers and what they say; then to the soldiers and their taunt (verse 36); then to the malefactors and their words (verses 39 ff.). Into this well-conceived passage, surely a product of conscious art, the reference to the inscription in verse 38 breaks very clumsily. This fact, together with its artificial connexion with verse 37 (The Soldiers' Taunt), and its linguistic similarity to Mk. xv. 26, leads us to suspect that it is probably a later Markan insertion.

(3) Whatever hesitation we may feel in the two preceding instances, we can have little or none in the case of Lk. xxiii. 44–5 ('*And it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing: and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst*'). Here out of twenty-six Greek words no less than seventeen are common

to Mk., a significant feature in a narrative which contains so few of such words. Nor is this all: in Mk. the Darkness and the Rending appear in different parts of the story, the Rending following the reference to the death of Jesus (Mk. xv. 33 and 38). In Lk., on the other hand, the two 'wonders' have been brought together, and both immediately precede the dying cry of Jesus. We can only suppose that these two incidents have been taken from Mk.[1] and deliberately conjoined by the Third Evangelist. But if so, we must look upon the passage as an 'insertion', for it is impossible to suppose that the two passages have first been brought together and then made the pivot around which a new rendering of the Markan story turns. If, moreover, we omit the passage, the Lukan story does not suffer; it actually gains in dramatic force. For, with the omission of xxiii. 44–5, the promise to the dying thief, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise', is immediately followed by the death cry of Jesus: 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost.'

Reference may here be made to a fourth passage which possibly might be viewed as a Markan insertion—the latter part of Lk. xxiii. 49, and perhaps indeed the whole verse. Of its eighteen words nine are common to Mk. xv. 40 f., and it stands just where the Markan passage stands, at the end of the Crucifixion narrative. It contains the reference to the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, and who stood, together with 'his acquaintance', watching the scene from afar. A comparison of the two passages, however, will show that the one in Lk., which if dependence must be conceded is the later, lacks the names of the women as given in Mk. Moreover, as we shall see later, xxiii. 49 is closely connected with xxiii. 55 f. On the whole, it is not probable that verse 49 is Markan; it really crowns the Lukan story and leads on to the account of the Subsequent Action of the Women (Lk. xxiii. 55–6 a).

We may sum up our investigation of the Lukan story of the Crucifixion by saying that the facts point to the view that it is

[1] The difficult phrase *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος*, however we explain it, supports this conclusion, for it is plainly intended as an editorial comment on the Miraculous Darkness.

independent of Mk., except in the case of a few later Markan insertions. If we ask why these insertions have been made, especially when, as we have argued, they impair the literary unity and dramatic force of the Lukan story, we can only say in this, as in other similar instances, that St. Luke is a teacher first and an artist second. He has the courage to diminish in a measure the beauty of his original draft by additions which he believes to be important.

13. *The Burial.*

(Lk. xxiii. 50–4, Mk. xv. 42–7.)

Like the story of Peter's Denial, the story of Joseph of Arimathaea and of the Burial of Jesus is probably derived from Mk. The percentage of words found also in Mk. is 44·6. Moreover, a comparison of the two narratives shows that Lk. xxiii. 50–4 is really St. Mark's story abbreviated and furnished with a few explanatory notes. Thus it is explained that Joseph, although a *βουλευτής*, had not consented to the counsel and deed of the priests. Arimathaea is designated 'a city of the Jews', and the tomb is described as 'hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain'. Further, the Lukan context in which the Burial Story stands, presents phenomena which look very much like modifications due to the insertion of that narrative. For in xxiii. 49 and xxiii. 55 we appear to have a doublet which owes its existence to the separation of passages which originally were conjoined. In xxiii. 49 we read of 'women that followed with him from Galilee' (*γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*), and in xxiii. 55 of 'the women, which had come with him out of Galilee' (*αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ*). It will be seen that in the former passage (WH text) *γυναῖκες* lacks the article. Hence it is that in the second passage *αἱ γυναῖκες* is resumptive in force, and the second reference to Galilee, absent we may suppose in the non-Markan source, has been added after the insertion of the Burial Story of xxiii. 50–4. This argument, it is true, assumes the independence and non-Markan character of xxiii. 55 f., a matter we have yet to discuss. Apart, however, from this particular argument, the

evidence is sufficient to show that the Burial Story is taken from Mk. The change of position in the temporal statement of xxiii. 54 ('And it was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on') from the beginning of the story (as in Mk.) to the end is probably due to the Lukan context into which the story was introduced. This point will, however, be considered later.

14. *The Subsequent Action of the Women.*

(Lk. xxiii. 55–6 a, Mk. xv. 47–xvi. 1.)

Lk. xxiii. 55–6 a: 'And the women, which had come with him out of Galilee, followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments.'

Mk. xv. 47–xvi. 1: 'And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid. And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him.'

Few passages in the Third Gospel are so difficult to explain from the point of view of their relation to Mk. as Lk. xxiii. 55–6 a. So far as verse 55 is concerned, the passage does seem at first sight to owe something to Mk., and yet, on the other hand, there are strong reasons for ascribing both verses to a non-Markan source. Only two at most of the twenty-six words of the passage are common to Mk., and in Lk. there is no parallel to the names found in Mk. There is, however, a close resemblance between ἐθεάσαντο . . . . ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (Lk. xxiii. 55) and ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται (Mk. xv. 47) which may be thought to imply dependence, and the reference to the tomb in Lk. comes in very abruptly, if, as we have already argued, the Burial Story is a Markan addition. There is a clearer issue in the case of verse 56 a, which speaks of the preparation of spices before the Sabbath. For this reason it will be well to discuss this verse first.

The statement of Lk. xxiii. 56 a stands in complete contrast with what is told in Mk. xvi. 1. For according to Mk. it is *after the Sabbath is past* that the women buy the spices. This assertion is entirely consistent with the Markan story. According to St. Mark's representation of the course of events, there is no time

available for the purchase and preparation of spices before the Sabbath. Indeed, there is barely time for the Burial, for even before Joseph has interviewed the Roman governor, the approach of the Sabbath is very near (cf. Mk. xv. 42). It is still the Preparation (i. e. the Friday), but 'even was now come', and with sunset the Sabbath begins. Clearly everything is done in the greatest possible haste.

With such a source before him, it is difficult to think that St. Luke would have spoken of the return of the women and the preparation of spices *before* the Sabbath. For it is after he has spoken of the spices that he says explicitly, 'And on the sabbath they rested according to the commandment'. Why should St. Luke, if he is using Mk., introduce such a change? Why should he create a difficulty which the Markan story so expressly excludes? It is only a partial answer to say that St. Luke has extended the interval between the Burial and the Sabbath by transferring the temporal statement of Mk. xv. 42 (which precedes the Burial) to the end of his version of this incident ('And it was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on', Lk. xxiii. 54), in such a way that it refers rather to the subsequent action of the women. Undoubtedly St. Luke has effected this change, but why? Is it merely to enable him to depart from what is a very satisfactory statement in the Markan narrative, namely that the spices were not bought until after the Sabbath day? I find it very much more satisfactory to think that he is following a different tradition, and that the change in the position of the temporal statement was necessitated by his subsequent insertion of St. Mark's Burial Story into his already existing and independent non-Markan narrative.

Dr. Kirsopp Lake, who throughout his discussion of the Synoptic narratives of the Resurrection assumes that Mk. is the basis of St. Luke's story, has a very ingenious explanation of the question under consideration.

> 'I suggest that the explanation of this rearrangement is to be found in the fact that Luke did not fully understand or had momentarily forgotten the Jewish time-reckoning, and thought that, according to the law, Joseph of Arimathaea and the women had the whole of Friday evening and night at their disposal. Paraphrasing the Marcan account under the influence of this opinion, he naturally thought

that the women prepared the spices during the night before the Sabbath, and came to the tomb as soon as the Sabbath was over —that is to say, on the dawn of the Sunday.' (*The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 59.)

We may well ask if such an explanation is necessary. Is it at all likely that St. Luke would have 'momentarily forgotten' or failed to understand the Jewish method of reckoning days from sunset to sunset? The only evidence which Lake advances is the word ἐπιφώσκειν in Lk. xxiii. 54. The translation given in the Revised Version is 'And the sabbath drew on'. To this Lake takes exception, preferring the translation given in the margin, 'And the sabbath began to dawn', on the ground that in Greek there is no evidence for the use of ἐπιφώσκειν in any sense except in reference to sunrise. Without staying to argue whether ἐπιφωσκεῖν in relation to such a mode of reckoning days as that of the Jews might not after all be used in the sense of 'drawing on', or whether in the Lukan context any other translation than this is possible, we may hasten to ask if Lake's theory will stand *on his own translation* of the verb. It is of the essence of his theory that to the mind of St. Luke the women had the whole of Friday night until sunrise on the following morning at their disposal; but does his rendering of Lk. xxiii. 54 permit this? Plainly it does not, for the passage precedes the reference to the preparation of the spices. It follows therefore, on Dr. Lake's interpretation of ἐπιφώσκειν, only a few fleeting moments preceding the sunrise avail for the women's purpose. The 'night between Friday and Saturday' is not at their disposal. On a careful review of the whole question, our conclusion can only be that St. Luke perfectly understood the Jewish method of reckoning days, and that his difference from Mk. in respect of the women's action is due, not to any modification of Mk., but to his possession of, and preference for, an independent source.

This conclusion is considerably strengthened by the fact that the narrative of Lk. xxiii. 56b–xxiv. 11 (The Visit of the Women to the Tomb) is also independent of Mk., but this question has yet to be discussed in the next section.

Returning to verse 55, we may now say that what we have found in the case of verse 56a applies also to the substance of

the former verse. If xxiii. 56 a is non-Markan, substantially this must be the case in respect of the two verses, for they are closely connected with each other. If the reference to the tomb in verse 55 is thought to be too abrupt, may we not reasonably ask if this verse has not been modified in consequence of the insertion of the Burial Story? It may be, indeed, that the introduction of this narrative (xxiii. 50–4) has cancelled and replaced a simple reference to burial in St. Luke's non-Markan source. Verse 55 speaks of the tomb, and its existence as known to the non-Markan source is indisputable, if we are able to prove the non-Markan character of the story in Lk. xxiii. 56 b–xxiv. 11. It is not improbable that the description of the tomb in xxiii. 53 (The Burial Story) reflects information present originally in the non-Markan source. Mk. speaks of a 'tomb which had been hewn out of a rock'; Lk. of a 'tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain'. Professor Lake may be right in thinking that the Third Evangelist has failed to understand St. Mark's reference to a rock tomb, but our investigation has made us somewhat suspicious of these strictures upon St. Luke's ignorance. Granting that the Markan description of the tomb is the more probable, we may still ask if St. Luke's description does not ultimately belong to an independent reference to burial in the non-Markan source. This suggestion is highly speculative; but speculation has its place, when the available facts have been patiently weighed. Apart, however, from this particular point, our investigation as a whole gives strong support to the view that, in addition to Mk., St. Luke possessed a source which, after a passing reference to the burial, told how the women beheld the tomb, and then, returning to Jerusalem, prepared spices before the Sabbath began.

15. *The Visit of the Women to the Tomb.*

(Lk. xxiii. 56 b–xxiv. 11, Mk. xvi. 1–8.)

The present section is closely connected with that which has just been discussed, and the conclusion there reached raises a presumption in favour of the non-Markan origin of Lk. xxiii. 56 b–xxiv. 11. This view is certainly supported by a linguistic

examination of the narrative. For, of 163 words only 37 are common to Mk. (22·7 per cent.), and if we omit, as we ought to omit, the phrases in the Lukan story which are textually suspect,[1] the number of words in common sinks to 30 (or 19·7 per cent.). The phraseology of the passage is marked by several distinctive Lukan words,[2] and this is not sufficiently explained by the view that the Lukan story is a free rendering of Mk. xvi. 1–8. The difference already discussed in relation to the spices is only one of several so serious as to preclude the theory of Markan origin. Even as regards the closest parallel, the names of the women, there is a variation, Joanna in the Lukan narrative being mentioned to the exclusion of Salome. There is agreement as to the time and purpose of the visit and as to the fact that the stone was found rolled away, but in little else. There is in Lk. no parallel to the questioning of the women as to who should roll away the stone, while Mk. has nothing corresponding to the express statement in Lk. that the women 'found not the body' and were 'perplexed thereabout'. In Mk. they see 'a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe'; in Lk. we read that 'two men stood by them in dazzling apparel', and the implication is that they appear suddenly and are thought of as angelic beings. The difference is so great that even Professor Lake is momentarily shaken in his belief that the Lukan narrative is simply a version of Mk. 'Here, then, we have for the first time in Luke a probable trace of knowledge of a tradition not identical with Mark, and of alterations which seem to point to something more than the ordinary desire of a redactor to explain his source' (*op. cit.*, p. 67). The effect produced upon the women varies in the two narratives in line with the description of their experience; whereas in Mk. they are 'amazed', in Lk. they are 'affrighted' and bow down their

[1] The following passages are absent from D and several important Old Latin MSS., the first two being enclosed by double brackets by WH, and the third by single brackets: (1) τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (in verse 3); (2) οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη (in verse 6); (3) ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου (in verse 9).

[2] Note the construction καὶ ἐγένετο with ἐν and the infinitive. The following common Lukan words occur: δέομαι (Lk. (8), Ac. (7), Pl. (6), Mt. (1)); ἐνώπιον (Lk. (22), Ac. (13), Pl. (17), Rev. (33), rest of NT (7)); ἐφίστημι (Lk. (7), Ac. (11), Pl. (3)); ὑποστρέφομαι (Lk. (21), Ac. (11), rest of NT (3)). Other words of interest in this connexion are ἀπαγγέλλω, ἀστράπτω, ἔμφοβος, ἐσθής, λῆρος, μνῆμα.

faces to the earth. But the greatest difference of all is in the account of the words spoken to the women.

Mk. xvi. 6–7.	*Lk. xxiv. 5–7.*
Be not amazed:	Why seek ye the living among the dead?
ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, which hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold, the place where they laid him!	
But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.	Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,
	saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

That these two diverse traditions are related to each other is quite possible, but with what justice do we make the connexion literary, and charge St. Luke with having deliberately altered the Markan source in favour of the Jerusalem tradition of the Appearances of Jesus? What parallel can we cite to St. Luke's so drastic treatment of Mk.? Are we not forcing a theory upon the facts, if we say that here Mk. is St. Luke's source at all? We cannot press this question to quite the same extent as regards the remainder of the story, for, on the one hand, we do not possess the original ending of the Second Gospel, and, on the other hand, St. Matthew, who is dependent upon Mk., does alter his source in saying that the women ran to bring the disciples word. The First Evangelist, however, nowhere actually says that the message was delivered, and his characterization 'with fear and great joy' is an interpretation rather than a cancelling of the Markan statement that 'trembling and astonishment had come upon them'. There is certainly much greater variation in the words of Lk.: 'And they remembered his words, and returned, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest.' Here probably we have a separate tradition rather than a reinterpretation of Mk. We may sum up our discussion by saying that only an indiscriminate use of the undoubted fact that in considerable portions of the Third Gospel St. Luke has used Mk. as a primary source, can blind us to the probability that in this narrative, as in nearly all those connected with the

Passion and the Resurrection, Lk. and Mk. are independent works.

NOTE.—On Lk. xxiv. 10 no suggestion can be offered which completely clears up the difficulties of the passage: 'Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles.' It is difficult to think that the first half of the verse is a Markan insertion (based on Mk. xvi. 1), because, although on the other occasions when the women are mentioned in Lk. (xxiii. 49, 55) no names are given, there is special appropriateness in recording the names just at the point where the message to the eleven is mentioned. The verse as it stands is awkward, if, on the textual evidence which is very strong, we must read two separate sentences. For in the light of the preceding verse ('and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest') a distinction, really impossible, is apparently drawn between the 'eleven and the rest' and the 'apostles'. A distinction also seems to be made between Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James and 'the other women'. If the textual evidence[1] were a little more favourable, we should prefer to read αἱ before ἔλεγον and so take the verse as one sentence. The harshness is so great that it is open to question whether we ought not to do this in any case.

16. *The Appearance on the Way to Emmaus* (Lk. xxiv. 13–35), *An Appearance to the Apostles* (Lk. xxiv. 36–49), *The Ascension* (Lk. xxiv. 50–3).

Strictly speaking, the passage Lk. xxiv. 13–53 does not require to be considered in a chapter which discusses St. Luke's use of Mk., for the whole of this section is peculiar to Lk. It will serve the end of completeness, however, if we consider the relation in which the passage stands to the non-Markan elements in Lk. xxii.–xxiv.

If we are right in thinking that St. Luke's account of the Action of the Women after the Crucifixion and their subsequent Visit to the Tomb was put together independently of Mk., it is reasonable to regard Lk. xxiv. 13–53 as the continuation of the same narrative. No source, giving an account of the Resurrection, can be thought of as ending with the Visit to the Tomb.

[1] Cf. Plummer, *I.C.C.*, *St. Lk.*, p. 549: 'The evidence against the second αἱ (before ἔλεγον) is overwhelming . . . and the reason of the insertion is obvious.' The variant, however, is the relative, not the article. Om. by BN Sah., by D b d ff$_2$ q, and by e.

It is true that some scholars have held that the Second Gospel ends in this way, but the overwhelming weight of opinion regards the original ending of Mk. (after xvi. 8) as lost. Thus the presumption is that Lk. xxiv. 13–53 is the continuation of the narrative of the Visit in Lk. xxiv. 1–11. This argument cannot, of course, stand alone, otherwise we might justify the claim of Mk. xvi. 9–20 to be regarded as the genuine ending of Mk. In view of the textual and linguistic evidence, this, needless to say, would be absurd. But in the case of Lk. xxiv. 13–53, no one would doubt for a moment that the passage is the work of the Evangelist; all the stronger, therefore, is the presumption that it is the continuation of a non-Markan source in Lk. xxiv. 1–11. The only substantial objection is the semi-materialistic form in which the Resurrection Body of Jesus is conceived. The Risen Christ is represented as eating a piece of broiled fish, and as saying, 'See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having' (xxiv. 39). It is not unnatural perhaps, at first sight, to regard this as part of a relatively late account of the Resurrection. On the other hand, the very bare form in which the Ascension or, to speak more accurately, the Parting of Jesus from His disciples is described, together with the fact that apparently this event belongs to the end of the same day as the Resurrection itself, is surely a clear sign of the comparatively early date of the source in which it occurs. Moreover, are we right in thinking that the Lukan references to the Resurrection Body of Jesus imply a late date? Surely an argument of this kind is in the highest degree precarious. Whatever form that Body assumed, in view of current Jewish notions, it may well have been thought of as a body of flesh and blood even amongst the earliest followers of Jesus. Whether Lk. xxiv. 38–43 is strictly historical or not, there is nothing in this narrative which points to a date later than that of St. Luke's other Passion and Resurrection Stories.

§ 2. *Summary and Conclusions.*

In the foregoing discussion it has been claimed that, with the exception of two narratives, the Denial of Peter and the Burial

of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathaea, together with a few passages best explained as 'Markan insertions', the Lukan stories of the Passion and the Resurrection belong to a source or to sources independent of Mk. It now remains for us to consider the phenomena as a whole, in relation to the following questions:

(*a*) Does the evidence point to separate non-Markan sources or to one continuous non-Markan source?

(*b*) If the latter, was the source oral, or

(*c*) Was it documentary?

(*d*) Was the source limited to the Passion and the Resurrection, or is Lk. xxii. 14–xxiv. a sundered part of a larger source dealing with the Gospel story?

(a) *Reasons for speaking of a single Non-Markan Source rather than of various Non-Markan Sources.*

(1) In the first place, *the continuity of the several non-Markan narratives in Lk. xxii.–xxiv.* is of such a kind, that if we exclude all passages suspected of Markan origin, we are left with a continuous story of the Passion and the Resurrection, homogeneous in character and diction. We are left, not with a handful of fragments, but with a story which we can read as a whole. The only gaps are at the beginning, where no explanation of the 'hour' mentioned in xxii. 14 is given, and in relation to the Burial. These gaps, however, are not fatal to the theory under discussion. It is quite reasonable to suppose that the original beginning has been cut away and replaced by the Markan section in Lk. xxii. 1–13, and again to infer that the introduction of the Burial Story (Lk. xxiii. 50–4) has cancelled a reference to the tomb in the original source. For the rest, from the account of the Supper onwards, the narrative moves with such ease and vigour that to think of it as other than a continuous single source is all but impossible.

(2) In the second place, attention must be called to the *cross-references* and connexions between individual narratives. The account of the Institution is linked together with the other incidents and with the conversations belonging to the Supper in such a way that xxii. 14–38 is a unity. This passage is connected with the story of the Agony by the words, 'And he came

out, and went, as his custom was, unto the mount of Olives', and the succeeding story of the Betrayal is introduced by the words, 'While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas . . . went before them'. Like the incidents associated with the Supper, the Arrest, the Mocking, and the Trial before the Priests are firmly bolted together, and, as we have seen, the Trial before Herod is merged into the account of the fuller story of the Trial before Pilate. Much the same is true of the remaining narratives of Lk. xxiii. and xxiv. Even more than in the case of the Fourth Gospel, the Lukan Passion Story is a 'coat . . . without seam, woven from the top throughout'.

(3) Thirdly, *the portraiture of Christ* is the same all the way through. There is the same consistent attitude towards the crowd, to Gentiles and Jews, to the hierarchy, to women and to sinners. As during the Supper Jesus quotes Isa. liii. with the claim 'this which is written must be fulfilled in me', so in the Appearances the Risen Christ interprets from the law, the prophets, and the Psalms the things concerning Himself. We are amply justified in speaking of a continuous Lukan source rather than of separate sources, diverse in origin, which have been strung together. The Evangelist is an author and not a compiler or editor.

(b) *Is the Non-Markan Source an Oral Source?*

The trend of our investigation is steadily in favour of regarding the source as a document, and this is especially the case if we have correctly understood the use which St. Luke has made of Mk. This argument will be taken up again and carried farther, but meantime it is desirable to examine a theory which explains the matter peculiar to the Lukan Passion narrative as oral in origin.

In his essay in the *Oxford Studies*, to which reference has already been made, Sir John Hawkins says that he used to think the strongest arguments in favour of such Three Document Theories as those of Feine and others were to be found in St. Luke's Passion narrative. But closer investigation, he says, led him to think that St. Luke's additions to Mk. 'suggest a long

and gradual conflation in the mind rather than a simple conflation by the pen' (*op. cit.*, p. 90). He points out that St. Luke was a fellow worker with St. Paul, and so will have been a preacher of the Pauline type. In his preaching, the Crucifixion would be thrown into special prominence, and this would have its effect when St. Luke approached this theme in his Gospel.

> 'May it not have been thus that the preacher (and perhaps catechist) who afterwards became the Third Evangelist, had for his homiletic purposes gradually supplemented, and in supplementing had to some extent modified and transposed, the generally accepted Markan record, so far as it related to the Passion and the Crucifixion?' (*op. cit.*, p. 92).

In this way Hawkins explains the phenomena of Lk. xxii. 14 ff. as due to St. Luke's 'memories of his past teaching'. Hawkins supports this view by referring to the account of the Supper in the Third Gospel, and points to the account of this incident by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 23–5, 'the only exception to his silence as to the acts of Jesus which preceded the actual Passion'. This argument, however, really tells in the opposite direction, for St. Luke's narrative is very different from St. Paul's, if we omit the interpolation in Lk. xxii. 19 b–20. Hawkins also observes that St. Luke's 'peculiar' matter is generally 'of such a kind as would be attractive and interesting when used in preaching' (*op. cit.*, p. 93).

In the introductory essay in the *Oxford Studies* Dr. Sanday discussed this theory, and expressed a personal preference for Hawkins's earlier view.[1] Dr. Sanday pointed out that none of St. Luke's additions has any doctrinal significance. 'St. Luke's additions are *narrative for narrative's sake*, not narrative for the sake of doctrine' (*op. cit.*, p. xiv). The character of the added matter is naturally accounted for if St. Luke had access to some special source of information; 'they do not seem to deal with the special doctrinal teaching of St. Paul'.[2] This effective

[1] 'As at present advised, I should be inclined to agree with his earlier views rather than with those which he holds at present' (*O.S.S.*, p. xiii).

[2] A similar view is expressed by Dr. Moffatt (*I.N.T.*, pp. 274 ff.), who says that no source need be postulated from St. Paul. All that St. Luke needed for a basis was some oral tradition. The Herod scene in particular 'probably came from a source or sources connected with Joanna and Chuza'.

criticism tells rather strongly against Sir John Hawkins's interesting theory, and without mentioning detailed arguments favours the view that the source used by St. Luke was documentary. This is the conclusion to which the investigation made in the present chapter points, and reasons must now be stated for preferring this alternative.

(c) *Reasons for regarding the Non-Markan Source as a Document.*

The objections which have already been urged against regarding the Lukan Passion narrative as dependent upon an oral source are so many arguments in favour of viewing the non-Markan source as a document. But there are also several positive considerations which point in the same direction.

(1) In the first place, this is the conclusion suggested by the specifically *Markan elements* in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. Everywhere we found reason to speak of these as 'insertions', and this, of course, implies the existence of a written document. Needless to say, this argument is valid only so far as the Markan elements are correctly described as 'insertions'. Such, however, appears to be their character. For example, with the elimination of the Markan Story of the Denial, we find that the reference to the Journey to the High Priest's House and the story of the Mocking come together with improved sequence, and similar phenomena appear in the story of the Crucifixion. It is largely the discovery that the Burial Story is Markan, which explains the consistency of St. Luke's account of the Women's Action after the Crucifixion. Allowing room for doubt, as we must, in the case of the shorter passages, the peculiar character of the Markan details, such as the Prediction of the Denial, the Severing of the Ear of the High Priest's Servant, the Superscription, and the Darkness and Rending, points to the existence of a written source in which they appear as secondary strata.

(2) A second reason for affirming the documentary character of the non-Markan source appears when we study the *variations of order* in the Lukan story when compared with the order of Mk. A list of no less than twelve of these variations is given by

Sir John Hawkins, who explains them as the product of memoriter narrative and instruction. Thus, he rightly observes that 'such inversions of order are very much more likely to occur in oral than in documentary transmission' (*op. cit.*, p. 84). This is an excellent explanation of the phenomena in question, so long as we assume that Mk. is St. Luke's principal source, and so long as we explain, with Hawkins, the matter peculiar to Lk. in the Passion narrative as the result of 'a long and gradual conflation in the mind' of the Evangelist. In addition to the objections already urged, it will be noticed that Hawkins's theory implies that St. Luke has forgotten the order in which the incidents and sayings in question actually occurred in Mk. We shall find it impossible to accept this assumption, not only on grounds of general probability, but also because of the facts themselves as they appear in the Third Gospel. A better explanation of these inversions of order will be found in the theory that St. Luke's Passion narrative is non-Markan with a few Markan additions. In order to show this, it is necessary to draw up a list of the twelve instances of variation in respect of order which Sir John Hawkins mentions (*op. cit.*, pp. 81 ff.).

It will be seen that five of the inversions of order in the list opposite (Nos. 1, 6, 8, 11, 12) are at once explained if such was the sequence in which the events stood in the non-Markan source. On this theory, variation is due, not to forgetfulness of Mk., but to definite preference for another source. Still more interesting are the remaining instances of variation (Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10), for these are the very passages which our investigation reveals as 'Markan insertions'. We have increased confidence in regarding them as such when we find that the *same theory which explains them as 'insertions' or 'extracts' also explains them as examples of inversion of order.* The conditions are such that they simply cannot appear in the Third Gospel in the order in which they appear in Mk. They are found in a different sequence just because they are inserted in Lk. Later strata, they had to take the place which earlier conditions had left. So far from presenting difficulties, the variations of order are already implied in and necessitated by our theory of the composition of the Lukan Passion narrative. They are just what we may expect; not something we have to justify.

(3) A third argument in favour of the existence of the non-Markan document is the fact that, *on this theory, we can definitely prove that the Third Evangelist was well alive to the order of his Markan source.* We have no need to assume the

		In relation to	*Found in Mk.*	*Found in Lk.*
1.	The Prediction of the Betrayal.	The Supper.	Before.	After.
2.	The Cup.	The Bread.	After.	Before (in shorter text).
	The saying, 'I will not drink from henceforth'.	The words of institution.	After.	Before (in longer text).
3.	The Woe pronounced on the Traitor.	The Questionings of the Apostles.	After.	Before.
4.	The Prediction of Peter's Denial.	The Departure from the Upper Room.	After.	Before.
5.	The Denial.	The Trial before the Priests and Mocking.	After.	Before.
6.	The Mocking.	The Trial before the Priests.	After.	Before.
7.	The Superscription.	The Mockery of various Onlookers.	Before (all).	After (some).
8.	Mockery by the Soldiers.	Crucifixion.	Before.	During. (Before in the case of Herod's soldiers.)
9.	The Rending of the Temple Veil.	The Death of Jesus.	After.	Before.
10.	Temporal Statement.	The Burial.	Before.	After.
11.	The Preparation of Spices and Ointments.	The reference to the Sabbath.	After.	Before.
12.	The Names of the Women.	The Visit to the Tomb.	Before.	After.

NOTE.—In every case, except No. 11, which is not mentioned in the First Gospel, Mt. follows the order of Mk.

existence of what Sir John Hawkins calls 'a long and gradual conflation in the mind'. The order of Mk. has not been forgotten; on the contrary, it is very much in mind. For if a list be made of the passages which we have found reason to call 'Markan insertions', it will be found that, with a single exception, they occur in Lk. in precisely the same relative order in

which they stand in Mk. This will be seen from the following table:

	List of Markan Insertions.	*Parallel Passages in Mk.*
1.	Lk. xxii. 19 a.	Mk. xiv. 22.
2.	„ „ 22.	„ „ 21.
3.	„ „ 34.	„ „ 30.
4.	„ „ 46 b (?).	„ „ 38.
5.	„ „ 50 b.	„ „ 47.
6.	„ „ 52–3 a.	„ „ 48–9.
7.	„ „ 54 b–61.	„ „ 54, 66–72.
8.	„ xxiii. 3.	„ xv. 2.
9.	„ „ 26.	„ „ 21.
10.	„ „ 34 b (?).	„ „ 24 b.
11.	„ „ 38.	„ „ 26.
12.	„ „ 44–5.	„ „ 33, 38.
13.	„ „ 50–4.	„ „ 42–7.
14.	„ xxiv. 10 (?).	„ xvi. 1.

The table supplies convincing proof that St. Luke has no confused recollection of the sequence of events in Mk.; he knows that sequence perfectly well. Indeed, we are left with the impression that, coming to the Markan story with his own narrative in mind, St. Luke as noted one by one certain features in Mk. which he desires to use, and that then, returning to his own work, he has introduced these borrowings in their original order at such points in his story as the existing matter permitted.

I cannot but think that the fact that the passages which we have designated 'Markan insertions' occur in Lk. in the very order in which they appear in Mk. supplies strong confirmatory evidence to the provisional conclusions already reached; it supports the view that we are right in calling the Markan passages 'insertions' and in looking upon the non-Markan contexts as parts of a previously existing document. As we shall see, in Lk. i.–xxi. St. Luke demonstrably follows the order of his Markan source with remarkable fidelity. On the ordinary theory regarding the composition of the Third Gospel, his relation to St. Mark's order is very different in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. *On the theory urged in the present chapter, his procedure is the same all the way through; wherever and however he uses Mk. he observes its order.*

It may reasonably be claimed that the above considerations, following upon the detailed discussion in the earlier part of the chapter, furnish us with strong reasons for thinking that *the*

substance of Lk. xxii.–xxiv. was put together independently of Mk., and that it existed as a document before St. Luke had seen Mk. At a later time the Third Evangelist expanded the Passion narrative by inserting extracts from Mk.

(d) *Is the Non-Markan Source in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. part of a larger whole.*

It is impossible to avoid asking this question, although the data at our disposal at present do not permit more than a very partial answer. For it is obvious that before a complete answer can be given, the remaining non-Markan elements in Lk. must be carefully examined. This much at least may be certainly claimed—the Lukan Passion narrative can never have begun with Lk. xxii. 14 ('And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him'). We may also fairly urge the antecedent improbability of a source so rich in historical details, and so evidently resting upon the witness of those in close touch with the facts, being confined to the incidents of the Passion and Resurrection. We may safely say that Lk. xxii. 14 ff. is part of a larger whole, but what is the extent of that whole we have yet to see.

III

ST. LUKE'S USE OF MK. IN LK. I–XXI. 4

In the present chapter we shall examine the Third Gospel to the point where the Eschatological Discourse begins, our object being to discover what portions of Lk. i.–xxi. 4 are based solely on Mk. In discussing this question it is not necessary to treat every section in detail, for, admittedly, there are considerable portions which owe nothing to Mk., and which therefore may be left aside. Thus, we have no need to consider the first two chapters (The Birth and Nativity Narratives) and the Genealogy (iii. 23–38), and we may accept the results of Sir John Hawkins's investigation[1] by which the so-called 'lesser' and 'greater' interpolations (vi. 20–viii. 3 and ix. 51–xviii. 14) have been shown to be non-Markan. We may further add iv. 16–30 (The Sermon at Nazareth) and v. 1–11 (The Call of Simon), for although there are parallel passages in Mk., they are plainly of independent origin. Again, xix. 1–28 (The Story of Zacchaeus and the Parable of the Pounds) is obviously non-Markan, and the same is true of xix. 41–4, which tells of the Weeping over Jerusalem. It is probable that xix. 37–40 (Christ's Approach to Jerusalem) is non-Markan also, but it will be better to reserve this passage for examination.

Having regard to Canon Streeter's discussion of iii. 1–iv. 15, we may also classify the whole of this passage as non-Markan.[2] In iii. 1–20 (The Preaching of John) the only verses to which there are parallels in Mk. are 2 b–4 and 16 (cf. Mk. i. 2–5, 7 f.).

[1] Cf. *O.S.S.*, pp. 29–59.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 167 f., 186 f. Streeter has returned to this question in *The Four Gospels* (pp. 205 ff.), where he also argues that iv. 14 f. is non-Markan. He points out that Mt. and Lk. agree in saying that Jesus went to Nazareth, and that both use the form Nazara, which occurs nowhere else in the NT. 'It would look as if Q . . . had a brief notice of the change of scene in which the name Nazara occurred' (p. 206).

As regards verse 16 Streeter has shown that, while the verse has much in common with Mk. i. 7 f., the expressions which it shares with Mt. iii. 11 indicate that both Mt. and Lk. rest upon Q, from which also the preceding and following verses were derived (Mt. iii. 7–10, 12 = Lk. iii. 7–9, 17). Streeter also contends that the quotation from Isaiah in iii. 4 ('The voice of one crying, &c.') was probably taken from Q (cf. Mt. iii. 3). The only real difficulty arises in the case of the phrase 'preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins', which St. Luke (iii. 3) shares with Mk. i. 4. This phrase does not occur in Mt. Accordingly we must suppose either that, in spite of its absence in Mt., St. Luke derived the phrase from Q, or else that, while using Q as his principal source, St. Luke added this description of the nature of John's preaching from Mk. Like iii. 1–20, the account of the Baptism of Jesus in iii. 21 f. is also probably non-Markan. The First and Third Evangelists agree in using *ἀνοίγω*, as against the Markan *σχίζω*, and the well-attested and probably original 'Western' reading[1] in verse 22 ('Thou art my Son: to-day have I begotten thee') points to St. Luke's use of Q.[2] As regards the Temptation (iv. 1–13), which follows the Genealogy (iii. 23–38), the source is clearly Q. There is also good reason to think that iv. 14 f. is non-Markan.[3] The passage tells of the departure of Jesus to Galilee and of the immediate success of His synagogue preaching. The language differs considerably from Mk. i. 14 f. Only the name 'Jesus' and the reference to Galilee are common to the two passages, and St. Luke tells us nothing of the message of Jesus as related by St. Mark.

Gathering together the passages noted above, we have the following list of non-Markan sections: Lk. i.–iv. 30; v. 1–11; vi. 20–viii. 3; ix. 51–xviii. 14; xix. 1–28; xix. 41–4. This list, of course, is not complete, but with the elimination of these passages the area of inquiry is considerably reduced. The following sections are left for discussion:

(1) Lk. iv. 31–44.
(2) Lk. v. 12–vi. 19.

[1] I have discussed the question in *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, pp. 24 ff.
[2] Cf. Streeter, *O.S.S.*, p. 187; *The Four Gospels*, pp. 143, 188.
[3] See note on p. 76 above.

(3) Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50.
(4) Lk. xviii. 15–43.
(5) Lk. xix. 29–40.
(6) Lk. xix. 45–8.
(7) Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 4.

There is, of course, little doubt that almost the whole of these passages is of Markan origin. In this respect, uncertainty attaches to a few narratives only; to Lk. vi. 12–19 at the end of the second block, and to Lk. xix. 37–40 at the end of the fifth. As regards the rest, the real problem to be considered is how far it is justifiable to claim Mk. as the *sole* authority. Are there indications which point to the existence of other sources, distinct from Mk., or was the Second Gospel St. Luke's only written authority for what he relates in these sections? Alongside with this question, the manner in which Mk. is employed may be considered. At present, however, we can do no more than note the character of the Markan material taken over by St. Luke.

(1) Lk. iv. 31–44.

The facts which are of importance for our inquiry will best be indicated by a table giving the contents of the section, the place of the narratives in the two Gospels, and the percentage of words which Lk. has in common with Mk.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
1.	The Synagogue at Capernaum.	iv. 31–7.	i. 21–8.	63.	52.
2.	The Healing of Simon's Wife's Mother.	iv. 38–9.	i. 29–31.	58.	
3.	Healings in the Evening.	iv. 40–1.	i. 32–4.	36·5.	
4.	Retirement of Jesus to a Desert Place.	iv. 42–4.	i. 35–9.	38·8.	

It will be observed that in each Gospel the order of the narratives is the same. As regards the first two narratives, there is nothing to suggest a source other than Mk., the variations being purely stylistic and explanatory. The same conclusion should

also be drawn in the case of the third narrative, although here the percentage is very much lower. In this story St. Luke both compresses and expands his Markan source; he omits what he regards as unimportant details, and brings out the implications of St. Mark's account.

In the case of the fourth narrative, the differences between Lk. and Mk. are very striking. The departure of Jesus is described in Lk. as part of a definite plan, rather than as a flight (cf. Mk.). The multitudes (cf. Mk., 'Simon and they that were with him') are already aware that Jesus intends to leave them, whereas in Mk. no such idea has yet occurred even to the disciples (cf. 'All are seeking thee'). In Lk. the constraint that is upon Jesus to go elsewhere is much more strongly expressed (cf. δεῖ, ἀπεστάλην). These differences, together with the small percentage of words which Lk. shares with Mk., seem to point to St. Luke's use of a source other than, or additional to, Mk. It is doubtful, however, if there is sufficient evidence to sustain this view. For (1) the order in which the narrative appears is St. Mark's; (2) the journey to 'a desert place' finds its explanation in Mk., where the retirement of Jesus is more clearly revealed as an escape from the facile popularity occasioned by His healing miracles; (3) the saying, 'For therefore was I sent', though differently expressed in Mk., is a striking parallel to 'For to this end came I forth' (Mk.).

The differences between the two narratives seem best explained by Dr. Sanday's suggestion regarding the difficulties occasioned by the use of ancient rolls for purposes of reference. An ancient writer 'would not have his copy before him, but would consult it from time to time. He would not follow it clause by clause and phrase by phrase, but would probably read through a whole paragraph at once, and trust to his memory to convey the substance of it safely from the one book to the other' (*O.S.S.*, p. 18). Something very much like this appears to have been St. Luke's procedure in Lk. iv. 31–44. The impression made upon the Evangelist's mind by the reading of Mk. i. 21–39 is fading as he comes to the closing incident, and failure to consult his source afresh accounts for the freer rendering. Some confirmation of this theory is afforded by the percentage of words in common with Mk. (63, 58, 36·5, 38·8).

The foregoing argument is one which we can only rarely apply, because we cannot be certain in many cases at what point St. Luke began to consult his Markan source. We require, moreover, a brief series of narratives, the first of which is reproduced comparatively closely. The only other case where one would feel confidence in pressing the suggestion is Lk. xviii. 15–43, which immediately follows the 'longer interpolation', because we can be reasonably certain that at Lk. xviii. 15 St. Luke must have referred to Mk. Here the succession of percentages is 87·7, 76, 45·9, 55·1. In the case of Lk. iv. 31–44 we have excellent reasons for thinking that the section was taken over as a whole from Mk., and very probably in the way Dr. Sanday suggested.

As bearing upon the question of St. Luke's method in using Mk., it may be noted what a unity Lk. iv. 31–44 is. The passage deals with twenty-four hours in the life of Jesus, and for the most part is made up of miracle-narrative matter connected with Galilee.

(2) Lk. v. 12–vi. 19.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
5.	The Cure of a Leper.	v. 12–16.	i. 40–5.	51.	
6.	The Cure of a Paralytic.	v. 17–26.	ii. 1–12.	45.	
7.	The Call of Levi.	v. 27–32.	ii. 13–17.	62·7.	
8.	On Fasting.	v. 33–5.	ii. 18–20.	73·7.	
9.	On Patches and Wine-skins.	v. 36–8.	ii. 21–2.	41.	53·6.
10.	Cornfields on the Sabbath Day.	vi. 1–5.	ii. 23–8.	77.	
11.	The Man with the Withered Hand.	vi. 6–11.	iii. 1–6.	43·4.	
12.	The Choice of the Apostles.	vi. 12–16.	iii. 13–19.	44·7.	
13.	Many Miracles of Healing.	vi. 17–19.	iii. 7–12.	33·8.	

It will be seen that in every case Lk. and Mk. agree in respect of order, with the exception of the last two narratives, which occur in reverse order in the two Gospels. It will also be noted that in these two narratives the percentage of words in common is not high, especially when, as in the case of the story of the

Choice of the Apostles, a list of eleven names is repeated in Lk. and Mk. It will be argued below that these narratives (Lk. vi. 12–16 and Lk. vi. 17–19) are non-Markan in origin, but first of all the other sections in the list must be considered.

In the first seven narratives there is no doubt that Mk. has been used as a source, and in some of them (e. g. Nos. 7, 8, and 10) there is no ground for inferring the use of any other source. The same conclusion should probably be drawn in the case of No. 11 (The Man with the Withered Hand). The numerous editorial variations account for the lower percentage in this narrative. Especially is this so in the closing verse (vi. 11), which in substance agrees with Mk., but in phraseology is entirely different. As regards No. 9 (On Patches and Wineskins), a comparison with Mk. suggests that the sayings were known to St. Luke in another form, but oral tradition as modifying the use of Mk. is a sufficient explanation. Mk. is also St. Luke's source in the case of Nos. 5 and 6 (The Cure of a Leper and of a Paralytic). In the body of the two stories the verbal parallels are very numerous indeed. While the variations raise the question whether St. Luke had a second source at his disposal, they do not require us to presuppose this. Editorial adaptation and the influence of oral teaching adequately account for the phenomena. As a whole, Lk. v. 12–vi. 11 is best described as a solid block of Markan material; the use of any other written source is improbable.

But can the conclusion just drawn be extended to the last two narratives in the list—The Choice of the Apostles (Lk. vi. 12–16) and Many Miracles of Healing (Lk. vi. 17–19)? To this question we must now return.

(a) *The Choice of the Apostles.*

(Lk. vi. 12–16. Cf. Mk. iii. 13–19.)

If we compare the Lukan and Markan narratives, we find that out of 76 words in St. Luke's story 34 appear in Mk. iii. 13–19. Of these, however, no less than 25 belong to the list of names, and 3 more are accounted for in the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄρος*. The remainder occur in the clause 'twelve, whom also he named apostles', and of this clause probably only the word 'twelve'

belongs to the true text of Mk.[1] Thus, the linguistic evidence in favour of the dependence of Lk. vi. 12–16 upon Mk. is negligible.

On the other hand, St. Luke's narrative contains an unusual number of characteristic expressions, such as *ἐγένετο* with the accusative and infinitive construction, *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἦν* with the participle, *ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσφωνέω*. These features, together with the unusual expression *τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and the words *διανυκτερεύων* and *προδότης*, seem to indicate something more than stylistic alterations of Mk.

Moreover, the material differences between the two narratives are considerable. In Lk. Jesus goes out into the mountain to pray, and continues all night in prayer to God, and it is on the following day that the disciples are summoned. We learn nothing of this from Mk. St. Luke, on the other hand, tells us nothing of the purpose of the selection. He does not tell us, as St. Mark does, that the twelve were appointed 'that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils' (Mk. iii. 14 f.). Again, there are differences in the two lists of Apostles. St. Luke does not mention Thaddaeus; he inserts Judas of James after Simon the Zealot, and, like the First Evangelist, names Andrew immediately after Simon Peter. By themselves these differences are small, but taken together, and judged in the light of the linguistic facts, their weight is considerable. We must conclude that a comparison of Lk. and Mk. goes to show the independence of St. Luke's narrative; he does not appear to be using Mk. at all.

(b) *Many Miracles of Healing.*

(Lk. vi. 17–19. Cf. Mk. iii. 7–12.)

In this narrative only 21 of St. Luke's 62 words occur in Mk. iii. 7–12. Not one of them is important and several of them are place-names. Characteristic Lukan features appear in the

[1] On the other hand, cf. Swete, *St. Mk.*, p. 58; Gould, *I.C.C., St. Mk.*, p. 57. 'Whom . . . apostles' is omitted by D, Old Lat. MSS., and Syr. Sin.

use of the nominatives (verse 17) which are construed with ἔστη (cf. Lk. viii. 3), and in the clause ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας (verse 19). St. Luke, moreover, makes no reference to the boat and the seaside; there is no suggestion of the proximity of the sea; on the contrary, the scene is a level place, at the foot or on the lower slopes of the mountain (verse 17). We hear nothing of the crying out of unclean spirits and of the charge to keep silence. The only features common to Lk. and Mk. are the gathering of the crowd, the healings, and the desire of the people to touch Jesus.

It should further be noted how closely the two Lukan narratives, Lk. vi. 12–16 and Lk. vi. 17–19, are linked to each other and to the account of the Sermon in Lk. vi. 20–49. Lk. vi. 12–49, indeed, is one literary whole. In Lk. vi. 12–19 everything hangs upon the words ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ (verse 17), and the whole is constructed in such a way that the stories of the Appointment and of the Healings prepare the way in the most natural manner for the account of the Sermon. Ultimate decision in such matters as those we are considering is largely a question of weighing probabilities. The evidence seems to me to suggest that the story of the Man with the Withered Hand (Lk. vi. 6–11) is the last passage taken from Mk. in this part of the Third Gospel. The probability is that both Lk. vi. 12–16 and Lk. vi. 17–19 were already connected with the Sermon (Lk. vi. 20–49) in a non-Markan document,[1] and that they are independent of the parallel narratives in Mk.

Returning to the Markan section, Lk. v. 12–vi. 11, we may note that it consists of material belonging to the Galilean Ministry, including three narratives of healing, two stories regarding the Sabbath controversy, the Call of Levi, and a few verses containing sayings of Jesus.

[1] It is noteworthy that in Mt. v. 1 Jesus is said to go up into the mountain (εἰς τὸ ὄρος; cf. Lk. vi. 12), and it is while He is there that the Sermon is uttered. It is also interesting to note that Mt.'s list of the Twelve (x. 2–4) does not seem to be based on Mk., for it is not a narrative of appointment at all. It is a mere list of couples of disciples, prefixed to the Charge to the Twelve (x. 5–xi. 1). Have we independent evidence in these facts of the presence in Q of a list of the Twelve? If this is so, St. Luke's narrative in Lk. vi. 12–17 is to be preferred, for the First Evangelist's list of couples seems to be adapted to fit the position in which it is found before the Charge.

(3) Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50.

A.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
14.	The Parable of the Sower.	viii. 4–8.	iv. 1–9.	62.	
15.	On the Use of Parables.	viii. 9–10.	iv. 10–12.	66·3.	
16.	Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower.	viii. 11–15.	iv. 13–20.	56.	58·5.
17.	Short Sayings.	viii. 16–18.	iv. 21–5.	55·7.	
18.	The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus.	viii. 19–21.	iii. 31–5.	55·5.	

B.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
19.	The Storm on the Lake.	viii. 22–5.	iv. 35–41.	50.	
20.	The Gerasene Demoniac.	viii. 26–39.	v. 1–20.	55·6.	
21.	Jairus's Daughter and the Woman with the Issue of Blood.	viii. 40–56.	v. 21–43.	50·1.	51·8.
22.	The Charge to the Twelve.	ix. 1–6.	vi. 6–13.	60.	
23.	Herod's Curiosity.	ix. 7–9.	vi. 14–16.	50·9.	
24.	The Feeding of the Five Thousand.	ix. 10–17.	vi. 30–44.	45·1.	

C.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
25.	Peter's Confession and the First Prediction of the Passion.	ix. 18–22.	viii. 27–33.	65·9.	
26.	On Discipleship.	ix. 23–7.	viii.34–ix.1.	83·9.	
27.	The Transfiguration.	ix. 28–36.	ix. 2–10.	37·2.	
28.	The Epileptic Lad.	ix. 37–43 a.	ix. 14–29.	40·3.	52·6.
29.	The Second Prediction of the Passion.	ix. 43 b–45.	ix. 30–2.	37.	
30.	The Dispute as to the Greatest.	ix. 46–8.	ix. 33–7.	50.	
31.	Of Helpers who are not Disciples.	ix. 49–50.	ix. 38–40.	73.	

If we allow for the Markan narratives omitted from the above lists, it is clear that, with a single exception (No. 18, The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus), the two Gospels agree

exactly in the order of narration. This striking fact sets up a strong presumption in favour of regarding Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50 as a third block of Markan matter. I have divided the table into three parts because it appears that in Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50 St. Luke has combined three successive portions of Mk., each of which is looked upon as a whole. *A* and *B* are distinguished by their subject-matter, and are separated from each other in the Second Gospel by the passage, Mk. iv. 26–34 (Parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed, and a Summary Statement regarding Parables), which St. Luke did not use. *B* and *C* are separated by the long section known as the 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26).

St. Luke's respect for the order of Mk. is so manifest that before proceeding farther we must give consideration to his departure from that order in the case of *The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus*. In Mk. this incident stands at the beginning of Section *A*; in Lk. it appears at the end. Why is this? One reason is that St. Luke has omitted St. Mark's section On Beelzebub and the Sin of Blasphemy (Mk. iii. 22–30), preferring to follow Q (cf. Lk. xi. 14 ff., xii. 10), with the result that the story of the Visit (Mk. iii. 31–5) is left isolated.[1] In Mk., as the Third Evangelist is using that Gospel, the incident appears as a fragment, not as part of a sequence. Accordingly, if he is to use the story at all, St. Luke is compelled to incorporate it in the first suitable place in his Gospel, which is at the end of the block of Markan matter included in our Section *A*. This explanation is satisfactory so far as it goes, but it does not altogether answer the question why the story of the Visit is placed at the end and not the beginning. We have a sufficient answer if we note what a unity Lk. viii. 4–18 (= Mk. iv. 1–25) is, consisting as it does entirely of *parabolic* matter, teaching, and sayings. If St. Luke observed this, and if the character of the material determined its selection, we can readily understand why this matter stands first, and why the isolated story of the Visit comes in at the end. In other words, the variation of order raises no difficulty once Section *A* is regarded as a Markan block selected because of its subject-matter.

[1] Cf. *O.S.S.*, pp. 56, 89.

Returning to the threefold table given above, we see how high is the percentage of words in Lk. which are common to Mk. There are only two narratives in which it sinks below 40, while the average for the whole of *A*, *B*, and *C* is 53·3. We now require to see how far Mk. is actually used in these sections, and whether there are signs of the use of any other written source or sources.

A.

Apart from the high percentage of words common to both Gospels in the passages numbered 14–17 in Section *A*, the very fact that St. Luke repeats St. Mark's obviously artificial order proves that he is following Mk. closely. Otherwise, it might be worth while, in view of St. Luke's many variations in matters of detail, to inquire whether he had not a second source at his disposal, in which the Parable of the Sower and the account of the Visit occurred in close succession.[1] We do not need this theory, however, since habits of oral teaching and the influence of oral tradition sufficiently explain the variations in Nos. 14, 15, and 16. As regards No. 17 (Short Sayings), we have evidence that a knowledge of these sayings in their Q form has affected St. Luke's use of Mk. here. For doublets of these sayings occur in other parts of Lk. (xi. 33, xii. 2, xiv. 35 b), where they are clearly derived from Q, and by comparison we can see that the use of each source (Mk. and Q) has been influenced by recollection of the other.

In the case of No. 18 (The Visit) we have already for purposes of discussion assumed the Markan character of this incident. This assumption is borne out by a comparison of Lk. and Mk., which shows that St. Luke's omissions and abbreviations are editorial. Dependence seems especially implied in the words 'Thy mother and thy brethren stand without' (Lk. viii. 20). These words are appropriate enough in Mk., where the scene is apparently a house (cf. Mk. iii. 20), but much less so in Lk., where the scene would appear to be the open air (cf. Lk. viii. 4). The Lukan statement, 'And they could not come to him for the crowd', seems to be inspired by St. Mark's remark, 'And a multi-

[1] Cf. *O.S.S.*, p. 328 *n*.

tude was sitting about him', while the closing verse in St. Luke's story reads like a summary of Mk. iii. 34 f.

With such qualifications, then, as are made above, we may say that in Section *A* we have no evidence of the use of any other written source than Mk.

B.

In this Section, as in *A*, there is no evidence which points to a written source other than Mk. This is especially the case in Nos. 19, 20, 21, and 24. Here many of the variations are stylistic and editorial, and others are due to opinions which St. Luke has formed regarding the details of the Markan stories. For example, in No. 20 (The Gerasene Demoniac), the devils are made to address Jesus rather than the man, their home is described as the 'abyss', and the vivid saying, 'My name is Legion; for we are many', is replaced by the sober explanation, 'Legion; for many devils were entered into him'. Similar variations, literary and didactic in character, occur in the story of Jairus's Daughter (No. 21).

In some of the Lukan narratives in Section *B* there are interesting parallels in phraseology with Mt. (cf. Nos. 19, 21, 24). These agreements, however, do not point to a document which the First and Third Evangelists have used in common, or to the use by one Evangelist of the work of the other. Undesigned coincidence, textual assimilation by copyists, subsequent revision of the Markan document, independent knowledge of the stories through oral tradition and teaching—these suggestions sufficiently account for the agreements in question (cf. Stanton, *G.H.D.*, ii, pp. 142 ff.).

In the case of No. 22 (The Charge to the Twelve), we have indications of the knowledge of a source other than Mk., for there are several interesting parallels between this section and Lk. x. 1–12 (The Address to the Seventy) which is drawn from Q. Substantially, however, St. Luke's source in No. 22 is Mk. and Mk. only; the Q element amounts to no more than a few words and phrases carried over by the memory.

The most interesting narrative in *B* is No. 23 (Herod's Curiosity), for in substance Lk. and Mk. differ considerably. In Mk. Herod's attitude is that of guilty fear; 'John, whom

I beheaded, he is risen'. In Lk., however, Herod's attitude is rather that of curiosity. He dismisses the suggestion that Jesus is John risen from the dead by saying, 'John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things?' This difference is so radical that we must conclude that St. Luke did not accept the Markan version as correct, probably on the ground of other and better information. In this connexion, it may be significant that he has made no use of St. Mark's story of the daughter of Herodias. It is all the more striking, however, to find that in spite of the divergence of the two narratives, Mk. is undoubtedly St. Luke's source. The only feature which he shares with Mt. is the description of Herod as 'the tetrarch'—probably an undesigned coincidence. The percentage of words common to both is comparatively high (50·9), and there are such close parallelisms in phraseology that we are compelled to conclude that St. Luke is using St. Mark's words while departing from the tenor of his narrative. Nothing suggests a second written source; the intrinsic improbability of what St. Mark relates, and the possession of special information from some one connected with Herod's court (cf. Lk. viii. 3, xxiv. 10), explain the alterations which St. Luke effects.

The subject-matter of *A* was seen to be almost entirely parabolic; in the case of *B* it is almost entirely connected with *miracles*. Of the 52 verses in the section no less than 43 relate to miracles wrought during the Galilean Ministry.

C.

The seven parts of Section *C* agree so closely in respect of order that we can have no doubt that Mk. is St. Luke's source. All we have to consider is whether there are signs of the use of a second written source. In the case of Nos. 25, 26, and 31 there are no grounds for such a supposition. It is true that in No. 25 (Peter's Confession) St. Luke does not mention Caesarea Philippi, relates that Jesus was praying alone,[1] and has no reference to the rebuke addressed to Peter; but no theory of a second written source is required to account for these facts. St. Luke's agreement with Mt. in the expression 'the third day' (Lk. ix. 22) as against Mk. ('after three days') is probably due to the influence of oral teaching.

[1] But cf. Mk. vi. 46 and see *The Four Gospels*, p. 176.

In No. 30 (The Dispute as to the Greatest), Lk. and Mk. agree closely in describing the taking of the child and the words of Jesus. The variations at the beginning of the story are probably due to abbreviation, and both here and in the saying peculiar to Lk. ('for he that is least among you all, the same is great') there are signs of the influence of the similar incident in the Lukan Passion narrative (Lk. xxii. 24 ff.).

As regards No. 27 (The Transfiguration), No. 28 (The Epileptic Lad), and No. 29 (The Second Prediction of the Passion), fuller consideration is necessary.

(a) *The Transfiguration.*

(Lk. ix. 28–36. Cf. Mk. ix. 2–8.)

In this narrative the percentage of words in common with Mk. is only 37·2. In part, this is due to the additional matter which St. Luke supplies, for of St. Mark's 121 words 66 (or 54·5 per cent.) occur in Lk. Many of St. Luke's variations are adequately explained as due to reflection or oral tradition. Thus he tells us that Jesus went up into the mountain 'to pray', and that the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah was 'his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem'. Again, St. Luke's description of the face and raiment of Jesus (Lk. ix. 29) is a conscious alteration of Mk. ix. 2 f. If we will, we can also in the same way explain St. Luke's reference to Peter and the rest who were 'heavy with sleep', and his statement that they saw Jesus with Moses and Elijah when they were 'fully awake'. Similarly we can explain the fact that St. Luke connects the fear of the disciples with the cloud ('and they feared as they entered into the cloud') as the result of an inference, for in Mk. the fear stands unexplained. In this way we can avoid positing a second written source, and account for St. Luke's narrative entirely in the light of his use of Mk. Nevertheless, the working out of this view fails to yield complete satisfaction, and there is much to be said for the opinion that St. Luke also knew the story of the Transfiguration in a non-Markan source. In any case, St. Luke has made St. Mark's narrative the framework upon which his own story is built.

(b) *The Epileptic Lad.*

(Lk. ix. 37–43a. Cf. Mk. ix. 14–29.)

We have a very similar instance to the above in the story of the Epileptic Lad. That so much of St. Mark's narrative is omitted is probably intentional, and it may well be that St. Luke's additions require no other explanation than reflection and oral tradition. In this way we may explain the statement that the incident took place on the day following the Transfiguration, and that the lad was an only son. The same considerations may also apply as regards the conclusion of the Lukan story—the restoration of the lad to his father and the astonishment of the onlookers. Again, however, as in the case of the story of the Transfiguration, we have to leave the possibility open that St. Luke knew this story in a source other than Mk.[1]

(c) *The Second Prediction of the Passion.*

(Lk. ix. 43b–5. Cf. Mk. ix. 30–2.)

The low percentage of words in common with Mk. (37) is partly due to St. Luke's additions, but this is not a complete explanation, for it is significant that only 42·5 per cent. of St. Mark's words occur in Lk. There are somewhat stronger grounds in the case of this narrative for positing a second non-Markan source. St. Luke connects the prediction with the close of the account of the cure of the lad, whereas Mk., followed by Mt., associates it with a journey through Galilee. The saying, 'Let these words sink into your ears', is peculiar to Lk.,[2] and so also is the explanatory clause, 'and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it' (cf. Lk. xviii. 34). Moreover, it should be noted that the prediction as given by Lk. refers to the fate of Jesus in very general terms. There is no explicit reference to His death and none at all to His resurrection. Grounds for a confident decision simply do not exist, but the case for the theory of a second written non-Markan source is probably

[1] Cf. Bartlet, *O.S.S.*, p. 323.

[2] 'A phrase Semitic rather than Greek in its concreteness, and such as would hardly occur to Luke of his own motion' (Bartlet, *O.S.S.*, p. 321).

here at its strongest in that part of the Third Gospel at present under review. Mk. is certainly used as a source, but we may doubt if this fact sufficiently accounts for St. Luke's version.

With regard to the three narratives examined above, it is no doubt disappointing not to be able to rise above 'buts' and 'notwithstandings', but our love for clear-cut conclusions must not override the uncertainties of the data. As a whole, Section *C* is a Markan section; whether a second non-Markan source lies behind Lk. ix. 28–45 (Nos. 27–9) is problematical.

The subject-matter of *C* is various. The principal topics are Christ's Messiahship, Discipleship, and the Passion. It may be significant that the only indications in Mk. which point to any place or district outside Galilee are in Lk. omitted. Thus, as we have seen, in Peter's Confession there is no reference to Caesarea Philippi, and it is upon the position of this town that the accepted opinion as to the identity of the Mount of Transfiguration is based. In Mk. the mountain is probably Mount Hermon; in Lk. it need not be Hermon at all. It is also noteworthy that in the Second Prediction of the Passion St. Luke has nothing to correspond to St. Mark's statement: 'And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee' (Mk. ix. 30). The consequence is that *in Lk. Section C is a Galilean Section throughout.* If this is so, we are compelled to view the fact in the light of St. Luke's failure to draw anything from Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 (the so-called 'Great Omission'), which immediately precedes that part of St. Mark's Gospel on which *C* is based (Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40). For the 'Great Omission' tells of a visit of Jesus to the borders of Tyre and Sidon (Mk. vii. 24), back through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee (Mk. vii. 31 a), and through Decapolis (Mk. vii. 31 b) to Bethsaida (Mk. viii. 22). It appears, then, that the omission of Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 and the treatment which St. Luke has accorded to Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 in Section *C*, stand upon the same plane in respect of the movements of Jesus.

NOTE.—In this connexion, reference must be made to the fact that St. Luke places the scene of the Feeding of the Five Thousand near Bethsaida ('And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida', Lk. ix. 10). Is this a case in which St. Luke describes an incident in Section *C* outside Galilee? The question is complicated

by the dispute as to whether there are two Bethsaidas, Bethsaida in Gaulanitis and Bethsaida in Galilee. See *D.C.G.*, i. 198 f. But if there was only one Bethsaida (Bethsaida Julias in Gaulanitis), and if this is St. Luke's 'city', it does not follow that he thought of the scene of the Feeding as outside Galilee. 'There is evidence enough to show that "Galilee" was often loosely used for the country east of Jordan and of the Lake . . . and the geographer Ptolemaeus speaks of Bethsaida Julias as "in Galilee", just as St. John does' (Sanday, *D.C.G.*, i., 270). Cf. to the same effect G. A. Smith, *E.B.*, i. 565 f.

(4) Lk. xviii. 15–43.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
32.	Blessing the Children.	xviii. 15–17.	x. 13–16.	87.	
33.	The Rich Young Ruler, &c.	xviii. 18–30.	x. 17–31.	76.	
34.	The Third Prediction of the Passion.	xviii. 31–4.	x. 32–4.	45·9.	68.
35.	The Cure of the Blind Beggar at Jericho.	xviii. 35–43.	x. 46–52.	55·1.	

The table shows that Lk. and Mk. agree in the order of Nos. 32–5. This fact, together with the high percentage of words in common, makes it morally certain that Mk. is St. Luke's source. With the exception of Mk. x. 35–45 (The Request of James and John), St. Luke has taken over Mk. x. 13–52 as a whole.

In none of the four Lukan narratives is there any sufficient reason to infer the use of a second source. Unquestionably this is the case as regards Nos. 32 and 33. The lower percentage in the case of No. 34 (*The Third Prediction of the Passion*) is due to the fact that the whole of verse 34 is peculiar to Lk. Apart from this verse the percentage is 65. Dependence on Mk. is seen in the fact that whereas in Mk. the delivering up of Jesus is mentioned twice, in Lk. it is referred to once. Editorial treatment will also explain the absence from Lk. of the Markan details mentioned between the two references to betrayal—the references to the chief priests and scribes and to condemnation. St. Luke's additions reflect the influence of non-Markan sources used elsewhere in the Third Gospel. This is so in the case of the words 'And all things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished', which remind us of Lk. xxiv. 25–7, 44 f. Verse 34 ('And they understood none of these things; and this

saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said') also recalls to us the similar Lukan addition in Lk. ix. 45 ('And it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it'). In no case is it necessary to infer the existence of a second source; St. Luke's version is Mk. with commentary.

In No. 35 (*The Cure of the Blind Beggar at Jericho*) St. Luke's variations are for the most part, and probably altogether, editorial. The closing words which describe the man 'glorifying God' and the people giving praise to God represent a characteristically Lukan expansion. The most striking difference between Lk. and Mk. is the fact that whereas St. Mark says that the cure took place *after* Jesus had gone out from Jericho (Mk. x. 46), St. Luke just as certainly describes the incident as taking place *before* Jesus enters the city (Lk. xviii. 35). It is impossible to regard the two narratives as relating to different incidents. Must we then infer the use of separate sources? This is very improbable. We must rather explain St. Luke's variation as due either to inadvertence, or, and much more probably, to literary considerations arising from the fact that the present incident precedes St. Luke's (non-Markan) story of Zacchaeus (Lk. xix. 1–10) which transpires as Jesus is passing through Jericho. Our conclusion, then, regarding the story of the Blind Man is that this passage is yet another excerpt from Mk. and from Mk. only.

The section, it will be seen, is not distinguished by any special unity of subject-matter. None the less, it is worthy of note that all the stories are *journey incidents* associated with the final approach of Jesus to Jerusalem. This character is given to them by the opening words in Mk. x. 1 ('And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judaea and beyond Jordan'), by the introductory passage in the story of the Rich Young Ruler ('And as he was going forth into the way'), and especially by the unambiguous statement of Mk. x. 32 ('And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem'). Although St. Luke has repeated none of these statements, we may justly suspect that it is the character of the four narratives as journey stories which has influenced their selection. There was no need to repeat the travel references of Mk. x. in view of the frequent references to

the approach to Jerusalem in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 and in the non-Markan parts of Lk. xix. (cf. especially verses 11, 28, 37, 41). If we are right in thinking that the alteration in the place assigned to the Cure of the Blind Man is due to the presence of the story of Zacchaeus, we have an additional reason for believing that St. Luke's interest in Mk. x. 13–34, 46–52 was determined by its character as a group of travel tales. For as a story preceding the arrival at Jericho, the narrative of the Cure falls into line with the rest.

(5) Lk. xix. 29–40.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*
36.	The Obtaining of the Colt.	xix. 29–36.	xi. 1–8.	60.
37.	The Approach to Jerusalem.	xix. 37–40.	xi. 9–10.	11·4.

The justification for separating the two passages is reflected in the percentage of words found in common with Mk. It appears further in the light of the variations in respect of subject-matter.

The Markan origin of No. 36 (*The Obtaining of the Colt*) admits of little doubt. Here out of 115 words in Lk. 69 are found in Mk. The phrase relating to the Mount of Olives ('the mount that is called . . . ') is explanatory, while the omission of the words describing the colt ('tied at the door without in the open street') is probably due to abbreviation. Similarly, 'the owners thereof' (Lk.) is secondary as compared with 'certain of them that stood by' (Mk.). The remaining variations are easily capable of like explanations.

With regard to No. 37 (*The Approach to Jerusalem*) our conclusion must be very different. St. Luke associates the incident with a definite locality, 'the descent of the mount of Olives', and he ascribes the rejoicings to 'the whole multitude of the disciples' who, in a characteristically Lukan passage, are said to have begun 'to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen' (xix. 37). All that corresponds to this in Mk. is the bare statement, 'And they that went before, and they that followed, cried . . .'. There is no reference to the place, and the identity of those who take up the

cry is not disclosed. Again, in the account of the words used, there are material differences.

Mk. xi. 9f.	*Lk. xix. 38.*
Hosanna;	
Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord:	Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord:
Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David:	
Hosanna in the highest.	Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest.

When we remember that even independent accounts of these words might be expected to have a good deal in common it becomes impossible to think that here Mk. is St. Luke's source. In the whole narrative out of 70 words only 8, all in the song of praise, are common to Lk. and Mk. The reference to the Pharisees, who said, 'Master, rebuke thy disciples', and the words of Jesus, 'I tell you that, if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out', are peculiar to Lk. The facts plainly suggest that if Lk. xix. 37–40 is dependent on a source, that source is not Mk.

(6) Lk. xix. 45–8.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*
38.	The Cleansing of the Temple.	xix. 45–6.	xi. 15–17.	88.
39.	The Priests' Plot.	xix. 47–8.	xi. 18.	27·7.

As in the previous section, there is a striking difference in the two narratives, and the question is raised whether in the latter St. Luke is using Mk. at all. In No. 38 out of St. Luke's 25 words 22 are common to Mk., but in No. 39 only 10 of St. Luke's 36 words are found in Mk. Moreover, of these 10 words 5 are accounted for by the phrase *οἱ . . . ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς*.

It is beyond question that St. Luke has derived his abbreviated account of the *Cleansing* from Mk. If we divide the Markan story into three parts, we see that he has taken over the first and third and has omitted the second. He gives, that

is to say, the beginning and the end of St. Mark's narrative, omitting the rest as unnecessary for his purpose. It is true that, as the story appears in the Third Gospel, the natural inference is that the Cleansing took place on the day of the Entry, whereas from Mk. (xi. 12, 15) we learn that it happened on the day following. This divergence, however, is due, not to anything within the Lukan story itself, but to the context in which it appears in Lk. The divergence is of interest as indicating the manner in which Mk. has been used; it does not affect the strong probability that for the story of the Cleansing Mk. is St. Luke's sole authority.

The account of the *Priests' Plot* is quite different. St. Luke introduces the story by the statement, peculiar to himself, that Jesus was teaching daily in the Temple. The effect of this statement is to introduce a difference between the two Gospels both as regards the occasion and also the ground of the plot. In Mk. it is natural to suppose that the plot is hatched on the day of the Cleansing. The two are closely connected by the words, 'And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him' (Mk. xi. 18). In Lk. the reference to daily teaching interposes an interval of at least a day or two, possibly more. The situation is not quite the same as that which obtains in the case of the story of the Cleansing. Mk. and Lk. differ as to the occasion of both events. But, in the case of the Cleansing, the divergence is due to the Lukan context in which it appears, and to the neglect of Mk. xi. 12–14 (The Cursing of the Fig Tree), whereas, in the case of the Priests' Plot, it is due to the presence of a statement within the Lukan version of this incident—the reference to daily teaching.

Further, the nature of the priests' dilemma is differently expressed in the two Gospels. This will appear if we set the two narratives side by side.

Mk. xi. 18.	*Lk. xix. 47f.*
And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him:	But the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him:
for they feared him,	and they could not find what they might do;
for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching.	for the people all hung upon him, listening.

In language alone the differences are striking, if we are to think of Mk. as St. Luke's source, but the divergence goes deeper than this. At first sight the ground of objection appears to be the same, since both Gospels speak of Christ's teaching. But closer study reveals the fact that St. Mark, at any rate, is not referring to a course of teaching, but to a definite utterance of Jesus—His words, that is to say, uttered in connexion with the Cleansing of the Temple ('And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers'). It is when they hear this (Mk. xi. 18) that the priests seek how they may destroy Him; it is this which causes their fear, and it is this teaching which astonishes the multitude. St. Luke's account of the Plot is not connected with the Cleansing in this definite manner, nor is it any particular saying of His which leads to the hostility of the hierarchy. Their anger is aroused by a course of daily teaching which is winning for Jesus the utmost popularity. He teaches daily in the Temple, and His success places the priests in a quandary, for the people hang upon Him, listening (Lk. xix. 48).

The question is obviously a delicate one, and a confident conclusion in either direction is to be deprecated. Each Evangelist is describing the same incident, and we naturally expect them to have a good deal in common, while allowing for the use of editorial freedom. To my mind the Lukan narrative is not adequately explained as a later version of Mk. xi. 18. The balance of the argument dips in the direction of claiming Lk. xix. 47 f. as part of a non-Markan source which traced the fatal denouement to the teaching of Jesus in Jerusalem rather than to the Cleansing of the Temple.

This is a suitable place for us to combine the results of our investigation in the present and preceding sections, so far as they concern St. Luke's debt to Mk. The period covered is that of the departure of Jesus from Jericho to His arrival and stay in Jerusalem. For this period, our conclusion is that St. Luke owes two stories only to his Markan source, the story of the Obtaining of the Colt and the account of the Cleansing of the Temple. From another source or sources he has derived his account of the exultation of Christ's followers as the city came into view,

his story of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem, and his reference to the daily teaching in the Temple which led to the enmity of the hierarchy. It is noticeable that St. Luke has no reference at all to a Triumphal Entry, but this is a matter which must be considered later (see p. 236 f.).

(7) Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 4.

		Lk.	*Mk.*	*Percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk.*	
40.	A Question about Authority.	xx. 1–8.	xi. 27–33.	69·4.	
41.	The Parable of the Vineyard.	xx. 9–19.	xii. 1–12.	50.	
42.	A Question about Tribute to Caesar.	xx. 20–6.	xii. 13–17.	56·7.	
43.	A Question about the Resurrection.	xx. 27–40.	xii. 18–27.	63·8.	61·9.
44.	A Question about the Son of David.	xx. 41–4.	xii. 35–7.	74·4.	
45.	The Condemnation of the Scribes.	xx. 45–7.	xii. 38–40.	78·7.	
46.	The Widow's Mites.	xxi. 1–4.	xii. 41–4.	67·2.	

In these seven passages Lk. and Mk. agree in order, and, with the exception of Mk. xii. 28–34 (The Two Great Commandments),[1] practically the whole of Mk. xi. 27–xii. 44 is contained in Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 4. The agreement in order and the high percentage of words common to both Gospels leave no room for doubt that here we have another block of Markan material used by the Third Evangelist.

There is no reason to suspect the use of any other written source in the case of Nos. 40, 44, 45, and 46, and this is probably true of the rest, Nos. 41–3.

The variations in No. 41 (*The Parable of the Vineyard*) are considerable, and the constructions in verse 11 (*καὶ προσέθετο ἕτερον πέμψαι*) and in verse 12 (*καὶ προσέθετο τρίτον πέμψαι*), and the use of *ἴσως* (verse 13) and *μὴ γένοιτο* (verse 16), suggest that St. Luke knew the parable in another form, which may, however, have been oral. In the same way we may explain the

[1] St. Luke has this incident in Lk. x. 25–7, his source being probably the Q document.

saying peculiar to Lk. in verse 18 ('Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken in pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust').[1] The details in which Lk. agrees with Mt. may perhaps point in the same direction [οἱ γεωργοί (verse 10), ἰδόντες (verse 14), and the order of the words ἐκβαλόντες and ἀπέκτειναν (verse 15), unless these agreements are mere coincidences].

In No. 42 (*A Question about Tribute to Caesar*) the variations are editorial. This is especially the case in the opening and closing verses.

Mk. xii. 13.	*Lk. xx. 20.*
And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians,	And they watched him, and sent forth spies, who feigned themselves to be righteous,
that they might catch him in talk.	that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and authority of the governor.
Mk. xii. 17 c.	*Lk. xx. 26.*
	And they were not able to take hold of the saying before the people:
And they marvelled greatly at him.	and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace.

The most interesting narrative in the section from the point of view of source-criticism is No. 43 (*A Question about the Resurrection*). There is no doubt whatever that Mk. xii. 18–27 is St. Luke's source, but it is very doubtful indeed if he has drawn upon Mk. for the saying in verses 34–6. If this is so, the fact that in the whole narrative the percentage of words in Lk. common to Mk. is so high as 63·8 is very remarkable. In verses 27–33, which relate the Sadducees' question and story, St. Luke is in almost verbatim agreement with Mk., and in verses 37 and 38 the percentage of St. Mark's words is 70·5, although here Mk. is freely adapted. All the more striking it is to find that in

[1] It is very doubtful indeed if we can assign this passage to Q. Mt. xxi. 44 (= Lk. xx. 18) is either an early gloss or an interpolation from Lk. In Mt. it is omitted by D and important Latin and Syriac MSS. See Allen, *I.C.C., St. Matthew*, p. 232 f.

verses 34–6 the percentage is just under 24. I do not think that we can do justice to the facts by saying that St. Luke's version is simply a free reproduction of Mk. A comparison of the two suggests that here St. Luke is to some extent independent of Mk., as will be seen below.

Mk. xii. 24 f.	*Lk. xx. 34–6.*
Jesus said unto them, Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures, nor the power of God?	And Jesus said unto them, The sons of this world marry, and are given in marriage:
For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage;	but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage:
but are as angels in heaven.	for neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.

This is not mere free reproduction; at any rate it is not free reproduction as St. Luke understands it (cf. verses 37 and 38). We must rather conclude that in verses 34–6 St. Luke practically abandoned his Markan source, preferring to give a similar saying of Jesus from some other source, though whether oral or written we cannot tell.

It appears then, that, with the qualifications noted above, xx. 1–xxi. 4 is a section taken over bodily from Mk.[1] With the exception of the last narrative (No. 46, The Widow's Mites), it is a unity in respect of subject-matter, for, apart from the passage mentioned, every incident tells of the controversies of the hierarchy with Jesus in Jerusalem.

Here we must leave the results secured in the present chapter. Only the Eschatological Discourse (xxi. 5–38) remains to be examined, and in view of its interest and difficulty it will be treated separately in the following chapter. When this has been done, we must consider as a whole the results obtained in Chapters II–IV in their bearing on the question of St. Luke's use of Mk.

[1] If we are right in claiming xxi. 5–11 as a Markan passage (see pp. 102 ff.), the limits of the section are xx. 1 and xxi. 11.

IV

THE LUKAN ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE[1]

As in the previous chapter, our object in discussing the Lukan Eschatological Discourse is to distinguish, so far as we can, its Markan and non-Markan elements, and to study the use which St. Luke has made of Mk.

It is the commonly accepted opinion that Lk. xxi. 5–36 is no more than an editorial version of Mk. xiii.; so much so, that as a rule the question is hardly thought worth discussion. 'These sayings', writes F. C. Burkitt, in reference to the Lukan Discourse, 'are nothing more than Luke's version of Mk. xiii. 3–37.'[2] This statement is repeatedly made in an interesting and valuable chapter in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Part I, vol. ii, pp. 106 ff.). Burkitt examines Lk. xxi. 7–36 for the purpose of throwing light upon the historical value of the speeches in Acts. His argument is that, while the style of Lk. xxi. 7–36 is characteristically Lukan, the passage is none the less a version of Mk. xiii. 3–37, and is thus 'a measure of the general faithfulness of "Luke" to his sources, and of the confidence which we may reasonably place in his reports of speeches in his second volume' (*op. cit.*, p. 115 f.).

Now it is indisputable that St. Luke has used Mk. in the construction of Lk. xxi. 5–36, but that the Lukan Discourse is simply a version of Mk. xiii. is quite another matter. If Mk. is here St. Luke's source, we must conclude that it has been employed in a very different manner from anything we can find

[1] Part of the present chapter and of the Appendix has already appeared in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January 1925, and is here reprinted (with the kind permission of the Editor, Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker) along with fresh material.

[2] See the chapter on 'The Use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke' in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 108. See also pp. 113, 115.

in the Third Gospel previous to the Discourse; in fact, we have to turn to the Passion narrative itself to find a parallel to St. Luke's procedure. It will be claimed in the subsequent discussion that for the greater part of the Discourse other sources have been used in addition to Mk., and that, while the latter is the earlier in point of origin, it was the former with which St. Luke became acquainted first and to which he gave his preference. Except in the first part of the Discourse, the non-Markan sources supply the framework, Mk. being secondary. Thus, we shall find that in Lk. xxi. 5–36 the Evangelist's literary method approximates to that which has already been observed in the Passion narrative, although in the Discourse a fuller use of Mk. is made than in the case of Lk. xxii.–xxiv.

Lk. xxi. 5–36 falls naturally into three sections: (1) verses 5–11 (cf. Mk. xiii. 1–8), (2) verses 12–19 (cf. Mk. xiii. 9–13), (3) verses 20–36 (cf. Mk. xiii. 14–37). The subject-matter of these sections is as follows:

(1) The Prophecy of the Fate of the Temple, and the Warnings regarding False Messiahs, Tumults, Wars, &c.

(2) Warnings as regards the Persecutions to which Christ's followers will be subjected.

(3) The Fall of Jerusalem, the Times of the Gentiles, and the Coming of the Son of Man.

§ 1. *The Prophecy of the Fate of the Temple, and the Warnings regarding False Messiahs, Tumults, Wars, &c.* (*Lk. xxi. 5–11. Cf. Mk. xiii. 1–8.*)

This portion of St. Luke's Eschatological Discourse must almost certainly be regarded as a free rendering of Mk. xiii. 1–8. There is nowhere any suggestion of the use of any source other than Mk.

(1) The percentage of words in common with Mk. (58·1) is high, and points to Mk. as the source employed.

(2) As regards the language, there are several clear instances of stylistic improvement. Among these we may notice the following: *βλέπω* is replaced by *θεωρέω*, *ἀκοὰς πολέμων* by *ἀκαταστασίας*, *θροέω* by *πτοέω*. These changes imply rather than discount the use of Mk.

5243

(3) Other variations can satisfactorily be explained as examples of editorial treatment. Thus, we have instances of abbreviation. St. Luke omits the reference to the fact that Jesus was leaving the Temple, and, instead of recording the exclamation, 'Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!', he gives a summary statement to the effect that such a remark was made. Further, the reference to the Mount of Olives is omitted, and so are the names of the four disciples who asked, 'When shall these things be?' The effect of these modifications is to unify the section. Other signs of editorial treatment are the addition of the word 'first' in verse 9, the introductory phrase 'Then he said unto them' in verse 10, and the more detailed list of woes in verse 11 as compared with Mk. xiii. 7.

(4) The only considerable addition in Lk. is verse 8 b: 'and, The time is at hand: go ye not after them.' These words, however, are merely an echo of the Q passage in Lk. xvii. 23; they do not point to the use of a second source for the section.

(5) Perhaps the strongest indication of the Markan origin of Lk. xxi. 5–11 is the fact that it reflects the same artificial arrangement of thought as Mk. xiii. 1–8. Although Mk. xiii. 5–8 purports to give the answer to the disciples' question in verse 4,[1] in point of fact it does not do so. In Mk. xiii. 5–8 the centre of interest is not, as in Mk. xiii. 1–4, the fate of the Temple, but rather the Parousia. Thus, the disciples are warned against being deceived by false Christs, and they are told that wars, rumours of wars, earthquakes, and famines will precede the end. It is clear that in the writer's mind the destruction of the Temple and the Parousia are viewed as synchronous events, but so far is he from making this identification evident within the narrative itself that, without explanation, a question regarding the one event is answered in terms of the other. The fact that Lk. xxi. 5–11 reproduces precisely the same succession of ideas is proof positive of its origin.

Fuller treatment than is strictly necessary has been given in the above argument for the Markan origin of Lk. xxi. 5–11. This, however, will prove useful, by way of contrast, in discussing the relation of Lk. xxi. 12–19 to Mk., and still more in the case

[1] 'Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?'

of Lk. xxi. 20–36. The passage treated above shows us the kind of thing we have a right to expect if the two remaining sections are also derived from Mk.

§ 2. *Warnings as regards the Persecutions to which Christ's Followers will be subjected.* (*Lk. xxi. 12–19. Cf. Mk. xiii. 9–13.*)

A comparison of Lk. xxi. 12–19 with Mk. xiii. 9–13 clearly shows that Mk. has been used as a source. This is manifest, not only in the fact that the section occupies the same position in both Gospels relative to the Eschatological Discourse, but especially in the close agreement of the two verses, Lk. xxi. 16 f., with Mk. xiii. 12 f. It is true that Lk. xxi. 16 is worded differently from Mk. xiii. 12, but its logical order ('parents, and brethren, and kinsfolk, and friends') bespeaks editorial arrangement, and finds a parallel in the earlier section in Lk. xxi. 10 f. (= Mk. xiii. 8).

But while it is beyond question that the Markan source has been used, the relation of Lk. xxi. 12–19 to Mk. is very different from that which we find in the case of Lk. xxi. 5–11. The variations in Lk. xxi. 12–19 are so many that it is difficult to think that Mk. is St. Luke's only source. The words in common are curiously distributed. In verse 16 f. there are 14 out of 24 words common to Mk., but in the remaining 74 words of the section only 14 find a parallel in Mk. In other words, half of the words common to Mk. in a section consisting of 98 words is found in a passage of 24 words. Moreover, while in the latter (verse 16 f.) there is a continuous Markan passage of 11 words, in the remaining and larger portion (verses 12–15, 18, 19) the words which also occur in Mk. are isolated words, only a single phrase common to Mk. and Lk. being found. Even in the case of this phrase (εἰς μαρτύριον), the closest verbal parallel in Mk. and Lk., the expression is differently used in the two Gospels.[1] Studied from the point of view of its linguistic relationship to Mk., Lk. xxi. 12–19 seems to rest upon a non-Markan source which has received a Markan addition. Its main and probably

[1] See p. 106.

its sole debt to the Second Gospel is its position in the Eschatological Discourse and the two verses, Lk. xxi. 16 f.

This, of course, at present can be regarded as no more than a very tentative conclusion, and it will be well, before considering other arguments which support it, to refer to an initial objection. If Lk. xxi. 12–19 and Mk. xiii. 9–13 are arranged and viewed in parallel columns, a considerable agreement in respect of the order of ideas is at once manifest. This fact, as well as verbal parallelism, must of course be taken into account. It will be seen, however, that this agreement in the order of thought is reduced, if we can sustain the view that Lk. xxi. 16 f. is a Markan insertion. For the rest, it is enough to say that the agreement is not more than we might naturally expect in two independent accounts of the same discourse.

As sustaining the inference regarding the existence of a non-Markan source in Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f., suggested by the linguistic evidence, a number of confirmatory considerations are forthcoming.

(1) In the first place Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. *is a literary unity.* This will be seen if we print the passage in full.

> 'But before all these things, they shall lay their hands on you, and shall persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for my name's sake. It shall turn unto you for a testimony. Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate beforehand how to answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or to gainsay. And not a hair of your head shall perish. In your patience ye shall win your souls.'

It is clear that if, as in the above, we omit verse 16 f., we bring the sundered parts into an excellent connexion. Verse 18 f., with their reference to God's providential oversight and the winning of the soul in endurance, follow admirably upon verse 15 with its promise of a Christ-given defence, which adversaries will not be able to withstand or gainsay. Arguments of this kind in themselves do not carry us very far. When, however, as in the present case, they are associated with others, they are important.

(2) In the second place, it should be noted that there is a rather striking *difference of tone* between Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. and Mk.

xiii. 9–13. This difference exists even if we compare the Lukan passage as a whole (i.e. including Lk. xxi. 16 f.) with Mk. Apart from verse 16 f., it becomes so great as to point to the theory of independent origin.

In Mk. the dominant note is that of solemn warning. Sombre in the extreme, the atmosphere is one of foreboding, unrelieved until we come to the closing words of the section ('but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved'). Betrayed, beaten in synagogues, arraigned before Gentile tribunals, Christ's followers are to declare the word given to them by the Holy Spirit in that hour. Deliverance is nowhere contemplated. The betrayal will be unto death, and it will be effected by those dearest by ties of natural affection. Hated of all men, they are to endure to the end, and so they shall be saved.

Now the drift of Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. is discernibly different from this. It is true that here it is said that Christ's followers will be arrested, persecuted, delivered up to synagogues and prisons, and brought before kings and governors, but all this, it is declared, will turn out to them for a testimony. The testimony is not, as in Mk., only a witness which it is open to their persecutors to receive (cf. Mk. xiii. 9, 'for a testimony unto them'); it is a witness which the persecuted will have the privilege of offering, and in the light of which they may view their sufferings (cf. Lk. xxi. 13, 'It shall turn unto you for a testimony'). Just for this reason it is that they are not to meditate beforehand how to make their defence; this is not their responsibility. Christ Himself will give them a mouth and wisdom. The issue is certain. The witness thus given to them will prove irresistible. Their adversaries will not be able to withstand or gainsay it. Not a hair of their head will perish, and in their endurance they will win their souls.

Such a passage as this bespeaks a writer independent of the one to whom we owe the parallel section in Mk. xiii. 9–13. Nor do I think that even if we include Lk. xxi. 16 f., with its more sombre note, we can account satisfactorily for the Lukan passage by the commonly accepted theory, that it is just the Third Evangelist's version of Mk. xiii. 9–13. What a curious amalgam is Lk. xxi. 12–19 as it now stands in the Third Gospel! Is it probable that the passage was penned, as it were, at a stroke?

Be it granted that Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. is perhaps unduly optimistic, it may none the less be an early non-Markan source, or an excerpt from such a source, with which St. Luke was familiar before ever he saw Mk. xiii. 9–13. As such, its use by St. Luke is satisfactorily explained, while his criticism of its optimism is reflected in the Markan passage which he has inserted in Lk. xxi. 16 f. Regarded in this way, Lk. xxi. 12–19 receives a consistent explanation. Can anything like this be claimed if we are satisfied to label the section as Markan only?

(3) As bearing on the same question, it is also important to notice that *there are greater signs of editorial adaptation in Mk. xiii. 9–13 than in Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f.* Streeter has pointed out that the Markan passage appears to reflect definite experiences of persecution, and in particular the experiences of St. Paul. St. Paul was accused before the Sanhedrin (εἰς συνέδρια); he was scourged five times in the synagogue (εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε); he stood before Felix and Festus (ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων), and before Agrippa and Nero (βασιλέων). Moreover, as Tacitus relates, Christians during the Neronian persecution were betrayed by their brethren (παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον), and were accused of *odium humani generis* (μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων) (cf. *O.S.S.*, p. 181). Now it is evident that while Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. is not entirely innocent of this tendency, it reflects it to an altogether less degree. This is especially the case if we are right in regarding Lk. xxi. 16 f. as a Markan addition, but it is apparent also in Lk. xxi. 12 f. Now this fact is inexplicable if we are to find St. Luke's source in Mk., for, on this view, we should expect clearer and not fainter signs of this tendency. The presumption is that the Markan passage is the later version, or at any rate that the Lukan section is independent of Mk.

(4) Finally, an important point emerges when we compare not only the passage under discussion with Mk., but also another saying about persecution in Lk. xii. 11 f. It is noteworthy that *although Lk. xxi. 14 f. agrees with Mk. xiii. 11 in respect of position, the passage Lk. xii. 11 f., which occurs in a totally different context, agrees more closely with Mk. in vocabulary and contents.* This will be seen if we set the passages side by side.

Lk. xxi. 14 f.

Settle it therefore in your hearts,
not to meditate beforehand how
to answer:
for I will give you a mouth and
wisdom,
which all your adversaries shall
not be able to withstand or to
gainsay.

Mk. xiii. 11.

And when they lead you to
judgement, and deliver you up,

be not anxious beforehand what
ye shall speak,
but whatsoever shall be given you
in that hour, that speak ye:
for it is not ye that speak, but the
Holy Ghost.

Lk. xii. 11 f.

And when they bring you before
the synagogues, and the rulers, and
the authorities (cf. Mk. xiii. 9),
be not anxious how or what ye
shall answer, or what ye shall say:
for the Holy Spirit shall teach you
in that very hour what ye ought
to say.

It will be observed that Lk. xii. 11 f. and Mk. xiii. 11 both refer to the Holy Spirit and to a definite 'hour'. In spite, however, of these and other close agreements, it does not appear to be the case that the one passage is derived from the other (Hawkins, *O.S.S.*, p. 37). On the contrary, it is more probable that Lk. xii. 11 f. is taken from Q. Now if this is so, we have still less reason to suppose that Lk. xxi. 14 f. has been drawn from Mk., for it has very much less in common with Mk. xiii. 11, in spite of its position, than Lk. xii. 11 f. has. Of the twenty-six Greek words in Lk. xxi. 14 f. only three, and these quite insignificant words, are found in Mk. xiii. 11. In Lk., moreover, the divinely imparted defence is the gift of Christ Himself, while in Mk. it is the work of the Holy Spirit. In these interesting facts we have indications that St. Luke knew the saying in at least two non-Markan forms. On the whole, it is best to conclude that, while Lk. xii. 11 f. is taken from Q, the Evangelist found Lk. xxi. 14 f., and the section in which it appears, in a separate source which is also distinct from Mk.

Note.—Mk. xiii. 11 is either derived from Q, or this is one of the cases where Mk. and Q overlap. Mt. x. 19 is practically a variant of Mk. xiii. 11, but it shares certain phrases with Lk. xii. 11 f., which may point to a common origin for both in Q. See Hawkins, *H.S.*[2], p. 104.

The foregoing arguments converge on the view that Lk. xxi. 12–19 is a composite passage, based primarily upon a non-Markan, and probably a pre-Markan source, which is to be found substantially in Lk. xxi. 12–15, 18 f. This source has been edited by the Third Evangelist in the light of Mk. xiii. 9–13, and has received from that Gospel the passage Lk. xxi. 16 f. as a subsequent addition.

§ 3. *The Fall of Jerusalem, the Times of the Gentiles, and the Coming of the Son of Man.* (*Lk. xxi. 20–36. Cf. Mk. xiii. 14–37.*)

The relation between Lk. xxi. 20–36 and Mk. xiii. 14–37 is a problem as interesting as it is elusive. If the words common to the two passages were distributed regularly, or even fairly regularly throughout, it would be reasonable to claim Mk. as St. Luke's only source. It is true that the percentage of words found in common with Mk. (37·6) is not a high one, but it might be a sufficient explanation to say that St. Luke's version of Mk. xiii. 14–37 is a free rendering. But the words common to Lk. and Mk. are not distributed with even fair regularity. On the contrary, they are massed in *four passages*, which together form but one-third of Lk. xxi. 20–36. These four passages contain 108 words, and of these no less than 88 (or 81·4 per cent.) are found in Mk. The remaining two-thirds of Lk. xxi. 20–36 stands out in striking contrast. It includes 178 words, of which 19 only (or 10·6 per cent.) are common to Mk.

The above-mentioned facts are sufficient to raise a question even if they are inadequate to answer it. *Is the substance of Lk. xxi. 20–36 a non-Markan source to which Markan passages have been added, or do these passages constitute a framework to which St. Luke has attached matter peculiar to himself?* It is to the former of these alternatives that the evidence seems to point. It does not appear to me to be possible in any case to look upon Lk. xxi. 20–36 as no more than a free rendering of Mk. xiii. 14–37. Such a theory does not suit a situation where four Markan passages are reproduced almost verbatim, while the remaining and more considerable Markan portions supply only a few insignificant linguistic parallels.

The four passages referred to are Lk. xxi. 21 a = Mk. xiii. 14 b, Lk. xxi. 23 a = Mk. xiii. 17, Lk. xxi. 26 b–7 = Mk. xiii. 25 b–6, and Lk. xxi. 29–33 = Mk. xiii. 28–31. These passages must first be considered in relation to their present Lukan context. Do they form an integral part of the Lukan Discourse, or have they at least the appearance of later insertions? In the next place, we must inquire whether Lk. xxi. 20–36, when bereft of these passages, possesses a unity of its own. The four passages must also be viewed in themselves and in relation to Mk. xiii. as a whole, while regard must be paid to those parts of Mk. xiii. 14–37 which demonstrably St. Luke has passed by. Finally, any solution we may reach must be tested by its ability to furnish a reasonable and credible account of the literary genesis of the entire passage, Lk. xxi. 20–36.

(1) *Four undoubtedly Markan passages in Lk. xxi. 20–36 considered in relation to their Lukan context.*

(a) *Lk. xxi. 21 a* (= Mk. xiii. 14 b): 'Then let them that are in Judaea flee unto the mountains.'

This passage is taken verbatim from Mk., where it appears in a natural and intelligible relation to its context. It there follows the reference to the man on his housetop who is not to descend for the purpose of entering his house in order to remove his goods, and to the man in the field who is not to turn back to secure his cloak. Can we say as much of the relationships of the passage as it appears in Lk.? Here it is preceded by a reference to the military investment of Jerusalem, and is followed by words which have no parallel in Mk.: 'and let them that are in the midst of her depart out; and let not them that are in the country enter therein.' The words 'her' (*αὐτῆς*) and 'therein' (*εἰς αὐτήν*) clearly refer to the city, and it is obvious that, with the omission of xxi. 21 a, we obtain a very much improved connexion of thought. Omitting this verse, we have, immediately after the reference to the plight of the city, a passage which speaks of two classes of people, those within Jerusalem and those without. We lose the not very relevant reference to Judaea, and at once bring *αὐτῆς* and *εἰς αὐτήν* into close connexion with the noun (*Ἱερουσαλήμ*) to which they refer.

(b) *Lk. xxi. 23 a* (= Mk. xiii. 17): 'Woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days!'

While the presence of this passage does not disturb the Lukan context, its absence would bring into excellent connexion the words, 'For these are days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled' (verse 22), with the prophecy, 'for there shall be great distress upon the land, and wrath unto this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations.' Verse 23 a, then, is capable of being regarded as a Markan addition; but I do not think that we can say more. Like the passage examined above, this verse is taken verbatim from Mk. (except that the particle δέ is omitted).

(c) *Lk. xxi. 26 b–7* (= Mk. xiii. 25 b–6): 'For the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.'

Again we have a passage, undoubtedly taken from Mk., which can easily be detached from its Lukan context. Not only so, but with its omission verse 28 follows with improved sequence on verse 26 a. After the vivid reference to signs in heaven and on earth and to men fainting for fear, 'and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world' (verses 25–6 a), there is much appropriateness in the exhortation, 'But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh' (verse 28). Can we say this of the whole passage as it now stands in the Third Gospel? Here the connexion between the description of the Messianic Woes and the exhortation to look up in view of the approaching deliverance ('your redemption draweth nigh') is interrupted by a reference to the deliverance itself ('And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory'). This is the sequence which the Evangelist has finally adopted, and it is not an impossible one; but it is certainly less fine and less natural than that which presumably it has replaced:

And there shall be signs in sun and moon and stars;
and upon the earth distress of nations,

in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows;
men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world.
But when these things begin to come to pass,
look up, and lift up your heads;
because your redemption draweth nigh.

It should further be noted that while in Mk. the shaking of the powers in the heavens is mentioned together with the signs in sun, moon, and stars, so as to form a whole; in Lk. the two are separated by the reference to the distress of nations and of men. The effect is to create in Lk. something which looks very much like a doublet.

(d) *Lk. xxi. 29-33* (= Mk. xiii. 28–31). The Parable of the Ripening Fig Tree.

There can be no doubt of the Markan origin of this passage. It consists of sixty-six words, forty-seven of which are common to Mk. (71·2 per cent.). Its form suggests that it is an insertion in its present context. In favour of this view the abrupt way in which the passage is introduced should be noted. The words, 'And he spake to them a parable', which have no parallel in Mk., betray the hand of a redactor, an opinion which is strengthened by the excellent connexion of thought which exists between verse 28 and verses 34–6:

But when these things begin to come to pass,
look up, and lift up your heads;
because your redemption draweth nigh.
But take heed to yourselves, lest haply your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that day come on you suddenly as a snare: for so shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of all the earth.

The warnings of the closing verses are most apposite after the exhortation to hope at the prospect of the coming deliverance.

If the features noted in connexion with the above passages stood alone, one could hardly with confidence regard these verses as later additions to a non-Markan source. But when, as we have seen, *these are the very passages which have most in common with Mk.*, while their Lukan context shares scarcely any linguistic features with that Gospel, the inference becomes

very much stronger. In the light of the manifest unity of xxi. 20–36, when bereft of these passages, it becomes almost irresistible.

(2) *Unity of the non-Markan Portions of Lk. xxi. 20–36.*

Our investigation has revealed four Markan passages easily detachable from their present context in Lk. xxi. 20–36, and in some cases with a consequent improvement in the sequence of thought. The natural suggestion is that these passages are additions to a non-Markan source, but this view can only provisionally be adopted, until further tests have been applied. One such test concerns *the nature of the material which is left when these passages are omitted.* Does this material consist of a number of disconnected fragments, or are we left with a section which possesses a unity of its own? The answer to this question admits of little doubt; the resultant matter is no patchwork or mosaic, but a well-articulated whole. In order to show this, verses 20, 21 b, 22, 23 b–6 a, 28, 34–6 are printed below as a continuous passage:

(But when ye see) Jerusalem compassed with armies,
(then know that her desolation is at hand).
And let them that are in the midst of her depart out;
and let not them that are in the country enter therein.
For these are days of vengeance,
that all things which are written may be fulfilled.
For there shall be great distress upon the land,
and wrath unto this people.
And they shall fall by the edge of the sword,
and shall be led captive into all the nations:
and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles,
until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.
And there shall be signs in sun and moon and stars;
and upon the earth distress of nations,
in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows;
men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world.
But when these things begin to come to pass,
look up, and lift up your heads;
because your redemption draweth nigh.
But take heed to yourselves,
lest haply your hearts be overcharged
with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life,
and that day come on you suddenly as a snare:

for so shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of all the earth.
But watch ye at every season, making supplication,
that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass,
and to stand before the Son of man.

In the whole of this long passage there are only nineteen words which occur in the parallel passages in Mk. The only phrases which seem due to Mk. are the reference to 'desolation' (ἐρήμωσις) in the second line, and perhaps, but by no means certainly, the conventional opening phrase, 'But when ye see' (ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε), and, if it is necessary, these phrases may be regarded as editorial touches, made by the Third Evangelist under the influence of Mk. For the rest, the passage has unity and a movement of thought which finds its climax in the enigmatic reference to the day of the Son of man, which is held back until the end.

(3) *Mk. xiii. as used and neglected by the Third Evangelist.*

In contrast with the unity of the passages displayed above, the fragmentary character of the four Markan passages (Lk. xxi. 21 a, 23 a, 26 b–7, 29–33) is manifest. In no way constituting the framework of the Markan narrative, these passages can only be described as 'extracts' or 'excerpts'. The first is a counsel regarding flight, the second a cry of anguish, the third a prophecy of the appearance of the Son of man, the fourth a parable which teaches the imminence of the Parousia. If it is still contended that these passages do not represent the whole of St. Luke's debt to Mk., and that other passages, more vital to the Markan Discourse, are reproduced by the Third Evangelist with the greatest editorial freedom, the reply is immediately to hand. *What use of a source is implied, when 'extracts' are reproduced practically verbatim, while the body of the source supplies the most meagre linguistic parallels?* It is not as if we can explain the 'extracts' as material carried over by some trick of the memory; they are so closely reproduced as to imply deliberate reference to the Markan Discourse. The natural presumption is that Mk. is used as a secondary source, as a supplement and not as a foundation.

This opinion receives further support when we consider those parts of the Markan Discourse which, on any theory of St.

Luke's literary methods, have been neglected. Some of these passages have been passed by presumably because parallel versions occurred in the Q document. Instances of this type probably occur in Mk. xiii. 15 f., 21, 34, 35, 36. Such, at any rate, is the usual explanation, and it is as much as we can say at present. Later, we shall find other instances of the same kind, and the question will have to be considered whether the Markan version is neglected, not because parallel sayings occurred in Q, but because St. Luke has given his preference to a non-Markan source (Proto-Luke), which itself in part was an expanded version of Q.

In addition to the sayings which also occur in Q, there remains *a series of Markan passages of which St. Luke has made no use at all.* These passages, which have a distinct family likeness, are as follows:

(a) *Mk. xiii. 19–20*: 'For those days shall be tribulation, such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never shall be. And except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he chose, he shortened the days.'

(b) *Mk. xiii. 22–3*: 'For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew signs and wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect. But take ye heed: behold, I have told you all things beforehand.'

(c) *Mk. xiii. 27*: 'And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.'

(d) *Mk. xiii. 32–3*: 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is.'

How similar the subject-matter of these passages is, will be seen at a glance. All refer to a divine visitation of a distinct apocalyptic character, the like of which has never been known before. The visitation is one of judgement. Only because of the elect's sake has universal destruction been averted. On their account a measure of mercy is extended to all flesh in the shortening of the days. The elect themselves have need to be on guard lest they should be deceived by pseudo-Messiahs and false prophets with their signs and wonders. But though watchfulness is necessary, the elect need have no fear. In the hour of

His wrath the Son of man will not forget His chosen ones. He will send forth His angels,and gather them from the four winds, 'from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven'. Meantime, the time of the Parousia is hidden; neither the angels nor the Son Himself knows the day and the hour, but the Father only. Ignorant of the time, the elect are ever to be on the alert.

It will be seen that these passages constitute a compact body of thought which gives definite tone and meaning to the Markan Discourse. Unlike the four passages which St. Luke has undoubtedly taken over, these verses are not fringes and cuttings; they are *of the very pattern of the Markan fabric*; they make it what it is. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid the question, *Why has St. Luke entirely neglected these verses?* Is his procedure consistent with the use of Mk. as a principal source?

In part, we may explain St. Luke's omission of the verses in question by his apparent distaste for apocalyptic; his sympathies, it may be thought, lay in another direction. It may be doubted, however, if this is a sufficient explanation. There are reasons for thinking that it was St. Luke's habit to treat his sources in a conservative rather than a radical spirit. In this connexion we can quote the opinion of Harnack, who writes: 'Alterations in the subject-matter of the source [Q] showing distinct motive and bias are extremely rare when compared with those stylistic changes which remind us of the corrections constantly made in our hymn-books' (*The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 113). Even in the matter of stylistic alterations, there are instances in which St. Luke has retained vulgar forms from his sources, which apparently the First Evangelist has dropped.[1] So far as the point immediately under discussion is concerned, Mr. C. W. Emmet in *The Lord of Thought* committed himself, after detailed examination of the evidence, to the thesis that St. Luke does not eliminate the eschatology of his sources.[2] It must be confessed, however, that one finds it very difficult to agree with this thesis, if Mk. is St. Luke's principal source in xxi. 20–36. Mr. Emmet's position is, nevertheless, supported by St. Luke's procedure else-

[1] Cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 15; *The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street*, p. 73; and Moulton and Milligan, *V.G.T.*, p. 7.

[2] 'It appears, then, that Luke has no particular bias against eschatology as such, but simply follows his sources' (*op. cit.*, p. 295).

where in his Gospel (ix. 26, xvii. 22–37, xxi. 32–3, xxii. 69) and in the Acts (i. 11, ii. 17 ff., iii. 19 ff.), and so far as it is valid it strengthens our doubts regarding the nature of the Evangelist's debt to Mk. in Lk. xxi. 20–36. If then we cannot adequately explain St. Luke's neglect of important parts of Mk. xiii. by his distaste for apocalyptic, we must seek a solution elsewhere; and such a solution naturally presents itself in the view that the Evangelist is using more sources than one. *In Lk. xxi. 20–36 he is using a non-Markan source*, eschatological it is true, but less objectively so than Mk. xiii. 14–37, and *it is the superior attractions of this source which account for his neglect of St. Mark's references to the elect, the shortening of the days, the angel-harvesters, and the secret day and hour.* Mk. is a supplementary source, not a foundation document. Such a view does justice both to what St. Luke has taken and to what he has left, and is consonant with the impressions we form regarding his use of sources. Further support for this opinion will be found in an appendix to the present chapter, in which an attempt is made to trace the literary genesis of Lk. xxi. 20–36. Dr. Burkitt surely reverses the probabilities of the case when he finds a criterion for the speeches in the Acts in the editorial use of Mk. in Lk. xxi.

We may summarize the results of the chapter by saying that we have found Lk. xxi. 5–11 to be a Markan section, and Lk. xxi. 12–19 and 20–36 to be non-Markan passages containing Markan insertions in Lk. xxi. 16 f., 21 a, 23 a, 26 b–7, and 29–33. In part, these results are similar to those reached by Mr. Perry in his *Sources of St. Luke's Passion-Narrative.* Mr. Perry, however, views the non-Markan elements in Lk. xxi. as parts of a single Apocalyptic Discourse within his J source, which, as we have seen, he dates in the year A.D. 45.[1] Apart from the manifest improbability of so early a date, sufficient grounds seem wanting to enable us to link the non-Markan

[1] 'It would therefore appear that we have in the Apocalyptic Discourse of Luke an apocalypse from the J source, which probably included Luke xxi. 10, 11 b, 12 a, 13–15, 18–20, 21 b–2, 23 b–6 a, 28, 34–8; and which was interpolated, by the evangelist probably, from the Markan source' (*op. cit.*, p. 38).

elements in Lk. xxi. 12–19 with other non-Markan parts of Lk., and much the same appears to be true in the case of the Siege-Oracle in Lk. xxi. 20–36.[1]

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

The Literary Genesis of Lk. xxi. 20–36.

The trend of our inquiry has been in the direction of showing Lk. xxi. 20–36 to be a non-Markan passage, enriched by Markan additions. If we are to be able to accept this theory with any confidence, we require to form for ourselves a credible picture of the conditions out of which it has arisen. That such an attempt must be speculative, and therefore provisional, goes without saying, but the use of imagination, controlled by such facts as we can find, ought not in these days to require defence, even in relation to Synoptic studies. To posit sources is not enough, unless we give a rational account of the way in which they have been used. To force a theory of editorial manipulation upon Synoptic material is a monstrosity; to suggest a way in which sources, provisionally laid bare by critical investigation, may well have been employed, is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

In attempting this task, we must first remind ourselves of what Criticism has said regarding the origin of Mk. xiii. It is now sixty years since the theory of an independent written source, embodied in Mk. xiii., was first put forward by Colani. The theory has steadily gained ground, though B. Weiss and B. W. Bacon prefer to regard the chapter as based upon sayings derived from Q.[2] Moffatt, indeed, characterizes the 'small apocalypse' theory as a '*sententia recepta* of Synoptic criticism' (*I.N.T.*, p. 209). Many attempts have been made to reconstruct the source, and different opinions have been held as to its Jewish or Christian character. On the whole, it is best to regard it as a Jewish-Christian compilation, of Palestinian origin, which already contained genuine sayings of Jesus, and which was adopted piecemeal by St. Mark.[3]

The importance of this theory, for our special purpose, is the light which it throws upon the period preceding and following the Fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. It was a period of intense excitement, during which Jewish Christians must have looked eagerly for sayings of Jesus which in the hour of political upheaval should guide conduct and answer the obstinate questionings of the mind. Mk. xiii. by its vague

[1] Cf. pp. 124 f.
[2] Cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 208 *n.*
[3] Cf. Streeter, *O.S.S.*, p. 183 *n.*

allusiveness carries us back to a point shortly before the investment of Jerusalem by Titus, and it is difficult to suppose that it was the only literary production of the kind, or that similar oracles did not come to light both during and after the siege itself. May it not very well be that Lk. xxi. 20–36 rests upon such an oracle?

The progress of half a century of Criticism in relation to the New Testament Apocalypse enables us to attain to something more than mere conjecture regarding the literary output of the period. It is not to be expected that critics like Erbes, Spitta, Wellhausen, J. Weiss, Bousset, and R. H. Charles should be at one in respect of details, or even in more important matters relating to the delineation of sources. Their agreement, nevertheless, in the broad thesis that Jewish and Jewish-Christian sources underlie the Apocalypse, is too solid to be dismissed; and, for our immediate purpose, it is the more important because some of these sources belong to the period preceding the tragedy of A. D. 70. Even in respect of details, one critic has been able to build on the work of another, as may be seen in the epoch-making Commentary of R. H. Charles.[1] Thus Charles follows Wellhausen in explaining Apoc. xi. 1–2 as a fragment from a Zealotic oracle written before A. D. 70.[2] Charles also builds on the work of Wellhausen, J. Weiss, and Bousset in establishing his own theory that Apoc. xii. 1–5, 13–17 a b rests upon a heathen myth, adopted and adapted originally by a Pharisaic Jew about A.D. 67–9. As used by the author of the Apocalypse, verses 14–16[3] are a meaningless survival, alien to his special purpose and to his convictions regarding universal martyrdom. In reality, these verses carry us back to the hopes and fears which preceded the fall of the city, and originally referred either to the oracle (Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 5) which commanded all Christians to leave Jerusalem before the siege, or to the flight of certain Jews to Jabneh before A. D. 70 (cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, vol. i,

[1] *I.C.C.*, *Revelation* (1920).

[2] 'These two verses, xi. 1–2, are a fragment, as Wellhausen was the first to recognise, of an oracle written before A. D. 70 by one of the prophets of the Zealot party in Jerusalem, who predicted that, though the outer court of the Temple and the city would fall, the Temple and the Zealots who had taken up their abode within it would be preserved from destruction' (*op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 274). Charles thinks that in their present context in the Apocalypse these verses cannot be taken literally; they must be interpreted wholly eschatologically, and several of the phrases symbolically. Wellhausen looks upon Apoc. xii. as a Pharisaic counterblast to the Zealotic oracle in xi. 1–2.

[3] These verses describe the flight of the woman before the serpent. Cf. especially verse 16: 'And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth.'

p. 332). Other sources utilized by the seer are thought to lie behind the imagery and symbolism of chapters xiii. and xvii. Charles himself is of the opinion that while the section which deals with the Seals (Apoc. vi.) is entirely from the Seer's hand, its text is dependent either upon the Gospels, or upon the document behind them, the Little Jewish-Christian Apocalypse (= Mk. xiii. 7–8, 14–20, 24–7, 30–1).[1]

Enough has been said to show that we have good reason to think of the decades preceding and following the Fall of Jerusalem as a period of considerable literary activity.[2] Thus, the common assumption that Lk. xxi. 20–36 is but an editorial version of Mk. xiii. 14–37 becomes anything but necessary; the Lukan Discourse may be viewed as substantially an independent oracle. Nor can we be surprised if its contents are at once simpler and more direct than the confused and enigmatic forebodings of Mk. xiii. In Lk. the siege is in actual prospect or in immediate retrospect. Everything turns upon the significance of this great event. The siege is looked upon not merely as one of a series of calamities; it is an upheaval which carries with it all else. Its significance is Christian as well as Jewish; it is not alone a signal act of divine judgement in the destruction of the city and the subjection of its people; it is the inauguration of a new epoch, the coming of 'the times of the Gentiles'. As such, it is conceived as sending a thrill throughout the whole world, nature itself throbbing in sympathy with distracted man. A note almost hysterical sounds in the description of men fainting for fear and for expectation of further impending woes. Against such a background of terror and despair the Christian is the one man who can lift up his head. For him destruction is the pathway of a redeeming God. A great day is at hand, for which Christ's followers must watch and pray. Nothing is said of that day except that it will come suddenly as a snare. Only at the end, in the reference to prayer for strength to stand before the Son of man, do we find the allusion which stamps this day as the day of the Son of man. In the absence, in this non-Markan source, of any reference to a dramatic, spectacular intervention, such as characterizes popular apocalyptic thought and appears in Mk. xiii., we can only look upon the coming contemplated as *a coming in history,* as the wrath of the Son of man in the destruction of the Jewish State, the death of the old and the birth of the new.

It is obvious that, to whatever extent this oracle rests upon the teaching of Jesus—and in its underlying principles, as distinct from its

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 158 f.

[2] Cf. further the passage i.–iii. 8 in the Book of Baruch (Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 497 f.), and parts of the Syrian Apocalypse of Baruch (Charles, *E.B.*, 217 f.; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 222).

form, it probably owes a great deal to that teaching—as a whole, it stands as a literary product closely connected with the siege. As such it can hardly have been the work of St. Luke himself. At the same time, the fact that he reproduces it whole, with the addition of 'extracts' from Mk., indicates his estimate of its value and the preference which he felt for it. But why, it will be asked, did St. Luke find it necessary to expand his original source? What explanation can we give of the 'Markan additions'?

It should be noticed that St. Luke is using his Markan source as far back as the beginning of Lk. xx. He is still using Mk. at the beginning of Lk. xxi., and if we are right in supposing that he already held in his hand a non-Markan source dealing with the fate of the city and the 'times of the Gentiles', it is clear that the oracle in Mk. xiii. 14–37 would immediately arouse attention. At once vaguer and more objective, it would awaken interest and provoke reflection. We must remember that the phrase 'the abomination of desolation' in Mk. xiii. 14 does not necessarily refer, and probably was not intended by its author to refer, to the Fall of Jerusalem. F. C. Burkitt is probably right in claiming that the Markan saying 'implies some general apocalyptic catastrophe rather than so mundane and secular an affair as a Roman campaign'.[1] Nevertheless, we can easily understand how St. Luke, under the influence of such a document as we have found embedded in Lk. xxi. 20–36, to say nothing of the fact of the Fall itself, came to identify the reference to the 'abomination of desolation' with the ruin of the city. Such an inference would at once stamp Mk. xiii. 14–37 as in some sense a parallel source to that which he already possessed. There would be passages in Mk., we may suppose, which St. Luke would view with little sympathy, while other passages again would commend themselves as valuable additions to his existing original. We account in this way for such additions to St. Luke's non-Markan source as the reference to 'desolation' in Lk. xxi. 20, and the mention of the flight to the mountains in Lk. xxi. 21. The pathetic reference to those with child and to those suckling children (Lk. xxi. 23 a), echoing as it does Old Testament prophetic language, appealed to him as an added detail depicting the horrors of the siege. From the same point of view we can explain the omission of the references to the shortening of the days (Mk. xiii. 20), and the sending forth of the angels to gather the elect from the four winds (Mk. xiii. 27). These are apocalyptic details which did not naturally relate themselves to the destruction of the city. The fact that in the non-Markan source the sidereal

[1] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 114.

disturbances are associated with the siege (Lk. xxi. 25) explains why the temporal statement in Mk. xiii. 24 is ignored ('But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, &c.'). The borrowing of the Markan Parable of the Ripening Fig Tree (Lk. xxi. 29–33) is explained by St. Luke's evident love for parabolic matter, and its complete relevance to the drift of his original source, an appropriateness which is enhanced by the substitution of the words 'know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh' (Lk. xxi. 31) for the Markan passage, 'know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors' (Mk. xiii. 29). The same may also be said of the suitability of the two following sayings taken from Mk., the certainty of the approach of the kingdom, and the assurance that Christ's words will not fail (Lk. xxi. 32 f. = Mk. xiii. 30 f.).

We have finally to consider the reference to the coming of the Son of man taken from Mk. xiii. 25 b–6 (Lk. xxi. 26 b–7). It is evident that this element has imposed on Lk. xxi. 20–36 an apocalyptic character very much in excess of that which the non-Markan source possessed. The latter does speak of the coming of the Son, but it is a coming in history, a visitation in the order of God's providential government. We can only say that it is the undefined, not to say enigmatic character of this thought, as it occurred in his source, together with the exhortation (Lk. xxi. 28) to 'look up' in view of the coming deliverance which led the Evangelist to take this vivid passage from Mk.

An alternative explanation would be to regard the closing words of xxi. 36 ('and to stand before the Son of man') as a further addition to the non-Markan source, made at the same time as the addition regarding the Son of man in xxi. 26, and in consequence of this addition. In this case, the non-Markan source contained no reference whatever to the Parousia; its subject was the Fall of Jerusalem in its twin aspects of judgement and opportunity. While there is something to be said for this view, it is probably too easy a solution of the problem. It fails to do justice to the idea of the divine deliverance, and to the expectation of a day (xxi. 34) which, apart from xxi. 36, is best explained as the day of the Son of man. We give the most satisfactory account of the closing verses of Lk. xxi. by the theory that upon the mystical and half-poetical conception of the Parousia as it appeared in St. Luke's non-Markan source, there has been imposed the more objective conception which the Evangelist found in Mk.

The introduction of this reference to the Son of man coming in a cloud carried with it the passage about the shaking of the powers of the heavens (xxi. 26 b) by which it is prefaced in Mk. (xiii. 25 b). Hence

it is that in Lk., contrary to what we find in Mk., the shaking of the heavenly powers is separated from the signs in sun, moon, and stars by the description of distracted nations and panic-stricken men (xxi. 25 b–6 a).

I should be the last to claim that the account given above of the literary genesis of Lk. xxi. 20–36 is, in all its details, a correct version of the Evangelist's procedure. Such a claim would be vain in view of the obviously narrow limits within which we can track the path of an ancient writer's literary methods. As supplying in outline an account of what St. Luke's procedure may well have been, the attempt has been made because, in default of a rational explanation of source-usage, our theories remain very much in the air. That a relatively simple account of the use of two sources, Markan and non-Markan, is possible, strengthens the case for their existence, as revealed in our investigation.

If we have correctly apprehended the nature of the oracle embedded in Lk. xxi. 20–36, we must conclude that it stands apart from other Lukan passages which speak of the destruction of the city, such as xix. 27, 41–4 and xxiii. 27–31. In none of these cases is it necessary to presuppose the events of A. D. 68–70. After all, was it difficult for any one familiar with the social and political situation as it existed in our Lord's day to foresee the peril of the city; and can we seriously think it impossible that Jesus should have spoken of the fate of Jerusalem? We may think, if we will, that the precise terms of such a prophecy as xix. 43 f.[1] have been influenced by the knowledge of the actual facts, but this is the utmost that need be conceded. Besides, we require, as it seems to me, more than invention and imagination to account for the oracle in xxi. 20–36; and a starting-point is provided if we have reason to think that Jesus did utter warnings regarding the city and wept over its fate. If xxi. 20–36 contained no more than such references to the doomed city, we might class it with xix. 27, 41–4, and xxiii. 27–31, and accept Harnack's opinion regarding their date.[2] As it is, xxi. 20–36 stands on a plane of its own; it rests upon earlier and genuine logia, but, as an oracle, it reflects the experiences it foretells. It supplies counsel for hard times and preaches hope in a darkness which is not yet broken. Harnack, however, is right in

[1] 'For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

[2] Cf. *The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 116 ff.

declining to date the passage *after* A. D. 70. What evidence in xxi. 20 ff. supports the assumption that the city has actually fallen? It is safe to say that if this oracle had not been composed until after the capture and sack of the city, it would be very different from what it is. The note of the whole is expectancy: the readers are to wait and hope; they are to pray for strength to stand before a day that has not yet dawned, but which will come suddenly as a snare. Thus, there are good grounds for dating the oracle within the years 67–9, but hardly earlier or later.

Is there any connexion between xxi. 20 ff. and other non-Markan parts of Lk.? The available data do not permit of a decisive answer; but since progress in Synoptic research, as in other problems, depends on asking the right questions, it is important to state the issue as completely as we can.

It is natural to think of the passage as a fragment from one of the sources referred to in St. Luke's Preface, as an excerpt which has been fitted into the structure of the Gospel by the editorial passage xxi. 37 f. But is xxi. 37 f. itself part of a non-Markan source? If we set the passage side by side with Mk. xi. 19, its substantial independence is manifest.

Mk. xi. 19.	*Lk. xxi. 37 f.*
	And every day he was teaching in the temple;
And every evening he went forth out of the city.	and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called the mount of Olives.
	And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple to hear him.

The two passages agree in speaking of the nightly departure, but St. Luke alone names the place of the bivouac and, what is more important, refers to a period of teaching which excited great interest in Jerusalem. This is not the only Lukan reference to Christ's teaching in the city at this time. As we have seen, there is a similar reference in xix. 47 a ('And he was teaching daily in the temple'), and there is a third reference of the same kind in xx. 1 (= Mk. xi. 27) which is certainly not taken from Mk.[1] Thus, the editorial passage, xxi. 37 f.,

[1] Lk. xx. 1, while dependent on Mk. xi. 27, contains the words, which are peculiar to itself: 'as he was teaching the people . . . and preaching the gospel.'

is capable of being viewed as part of a larger non-Markan source, and in this case it is reasonable to think of the oracle in xxi. 20–36 as also part of that source, whatever its ultimate origin may have been. On this theory, in consequence of the late date of xxi. 20–36, we should have to think of the non-Markan source as one which grew, and of xxi. 20–36 as one of its latest additions.

But the suggestion that the editorial passage is entirely non-Markan cannot be accepted with confidence. It certainly contains non-Markan elements, but, in the reference to the nightly departure from Jerusalem, it appears to be dependent upon Mk. If so, Lk. xxi. 37 f. would seem to be an editorial passage belonging to later stages in the compiling of Lk., and in this case, and especially in view of its late date, Lk. xxi. 20–36 is best explained as a non-Markan passage which, like the Birth Stories of Lk. i, ii, is separate and distinct from other non-Markan material in the Third Gospel. We may so far anticipate later discussion as to say that, if criticism is successful in positing a Proto-Luke document, the claim of Lk. xxi. 20–36 (less the Markan additions) to be part of that source is doubtful. In spite of this conclusion, however, the investigation of the passage is of value, for it reveals the same method of using Markan and non-Markan material which we found in the Passion narrative and which we shall find in other parts of the Third Gospel. The Eschatological Discourse differs from the Passion narrative in the fact that Mk. xiii. supplies the ground-plan on which the Lukan Discourse is built; *but in the Discourse, as in the Passion narrative, non-Markan matter is given the preference, and into it Markan extracts have been inserted.*

V

ST. LUKE'S USE OF HIS MARKAN SOURCE

In the last three chapters we have investigated separate portions of the Third Gospel in which Mk. has been used as a source. It now remains for us to gather up the results which have been reached, and to state, so far as is possible at the present stage of our inquiry, our conclusions regarding St. Luke's use and estimate of his Markan source. Consideration must also be given to those parts of Mk. of which St. Luke has made no use whatever, and which are commonly known as his 'Markan Omissions'.

§ 1. *The Markan Sections.*

Our investigation has shown that St. Luke has taken from his Markan source both larger sections and smaller extracts. Whether the difference is one of method or simply one of extent must be considered later, and especially when the non-Markan portions of the Gospel have been discussed. Provisional consideration may be given to this topic now, and for this purpose a full list of the Markan passages must be made, and their respective characteristics noted.

List of Markan Passages in the Third Gospel

1. *Lk. iv. 31–44.*	A section dealing with *twenty-four hours in the life of Jesus*, and consisting, for the most part, of matter relating to the healing ministry of Jesus in Galilee.
2. *Lk. v. 12–vi. 11.*	*Material belonging to the Galilean ministry*, including three healing miracles, two narratives relating to the Sabbath controversy, and a few verses containing sayings of Jesus.

3. *Lk. viii. 4–ix. 50.*
(A passage which consists of three sections.)

(a) *Lk. viii. 4–21.* — With the exception of one narrative (The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus), the section consists entirely of *parabolic matter.*

(b) *Lk. viii. 22–ix. 17* — Of the fifty-two verses of this passage forty-three describe *miracles* wrought in Galilee. Two are healing miracles and two are nature miracles.

(c) *Lk. ix. 18–50.* — The possibility of a second written source for three narratives in this section is difficult to determine (The Transfiguration, The Epileptic Lad, and The Second Prediction of the Passion). The subject-matter of the section is various. The principal topics are Christ's Messiahship, Discipleship, and the Passion. The scene throughout is Galilee.

4. *Lk. xviii. 15–43.* — The narratives are *journey stories* connected with the Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem.

5. *Lk. xix. 29–36.* — A single narrative (The Obtaining of the Colt) belonging to the Journey to Jerusalem.

6. *Lk. xix. 45f.* — A single narrative (The Story of the Cleansing of the Temple at Jerusalem).

7. *Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 11.* — A section consisting almost entirely of *stories of controversy* with the Jewish hierarchy at Jerusalem. Lk. xxi. 1–11 includes the story of the Widow's Mites and the first part of the Eschatological Discourse.

8. *Various fragments in the Lukan Eschatological Discourse.*

(a) *Lk. xxi. 16f.* — A reference to betrayal by parents, &c.

(b) *Lk. xxi. 21a.* — A counsel regarding flight to the mountains.

(c) *Lk. xxi. 23a.* — A cry of anguish.

(d) *Lk. xxi. 26b–7.* — A saying regarding the Parousia.

(e) *Lk. xxi. 29–33.* — The Parable of the Ripening Fig Tree.

9. *Lk. xxii. 1–13.* — Incidents leading up to the Passover.

10.	*Various fragments in the Lukan Passion narrative.*	
	(a) *Lk. xxii. 19 a.*	The reference to Bread in the Account of the Last Supper.
	(b) *Lk. xxii. 22.*	The 'Woe' expressed by Jesus regarding the traitor's fate.
	(c) *Lk. xxii. 34.*	The saying about cock-crowing.
	(d) *Lk. xxii. 46 b* (?).	'Pray, that ye enter not into temptation.'
	(e) *Lk. xxii. 50 b.*	The reference to the severing of the High Priest's servant's ear.
	(f) *Lk. xxii. 52–3 a.*	The words of Jesus to those who effected His arrest.
	(g) *Lk. xxii. 54 b–61.*	The Story of Peter's Denial.
	(h) *Lk. xxiii. 3.*	Pilate's question, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?'
	(i) *Lk. xxiii. 26.*	The passage which tells of Simon of Cyrene.
	(j) *Lk. xxiii. 34 b* (?).	The quotation from Ps. xxii. 18 ('And parting his garments among them, they cast lots').
	(k) *Lk. xxiii. 38.*	The Superscription.
	(l) *Lk. xxiii. 44 f.*	The Miraculous Darkness and The Rending of the Temple Veil.
	(m) *Lk. xxiii. 50–4.*	The Story of Joseph of Arimathea and the Burial of Jesus.
	(n) *Lk. xxiv. 10* (?).	The names of the women who visited the tomb.

It will be seen from the above table that the Markan matter is distributed in Lk. as follows:

(1) There are six considerable belts of Markan matter, viz. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 9, or eight, if we count the subsections of No. 3.

(2) There are two separate narratives which stand alone, No. 5 (The Obtaining of the Colt) and No. 6 (The Cleansing of the Temple).

(3) There are stripes of Markan matter which appear in the Eschatological Discourse and the Passion narrative.

The table also shows the unity of subject-matter which for the most part characterizes the larger Markan sections. The only exception is No. 3 (c), which is a unity only in the sense that it

contains Galilean matter.[1] The connexion of the first three sections with Galilee, and of the remaining seven either with Jerusalem or with the final journey to Jerusalem, is also worthy of note.

With the above analysis of Markan matter in the Third Gospel, it is useful to compare *the same material as it appears in Mk.* A table supplying this information will be given below. From it we shall see that for the most part St. Luke found homogeneous blocks of Markan material ready for use in the Second Gospel. In some cases, however, he appears to have broken up a Markan section so as to obtain two portions, one or both of which has a unity of its own. A word of explanation needs to be added regarding the Markan sections printed in the table. The limits of these sections have been determined (1) by treating the omission of two or more Markan passages as separating one block from another, and (2) by disregarding the omission by the Third Evangelist of single narratives within these blocks.

The Portions of Mk. taken over by St. Luke.

1. Mk. i. 21–iii. 6.	Lk. iv. 31–44. Lk. v. 12–vi. 11.
2. Mk. iii. 31–iv. 25.	Lk. viii. 4–21.
3. Mk. iv. 35–vi. 44 (with the omission of vi. 1–6 and vi. 17–29).	Lk. viii. 22–ix. 17.
4. Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 (with the omission of ix. 11–13).	Lk. ix. 18–50.
5. Mk. x. 13–xi. 8 (with the omission of x. 35–45).	Lk. xviii. 15–43. Lk. xix. 29–36.
6. Mk. xi. 15–17.	Lk. xix. 45 f.
7. Mk. xi. 27–xiii. 8 (with the omission of xii. 28–34).	Lk. xx. 1–xxi. 11.
8. Fragments from the Eschatological Discourse in Mk. xiii.	Found in Lk. xxi. 12–36.
9. Mk. xiv. 1–16 (omitting xiv. 3–9).	Lk. xxii. 1–13.
10. Fragments from the Passion and Resurrection Section in Mk. xiv. 17–xvi. 8.	Found in Lk. xxii. 14–xxiv.

[1] But see further, pp. 91, 132, where the omission by St. Luke in Lk. ix. 18–50 of St. Mark's references to places outside Galilee is discussed.

Provisional Conclusions regarding the manner in which Mk. is used by the Third Evangelist.

With the facts which have been elicited before us, we have now to try to form an opinion as to the way in which Mk. has been used by the Third Evangelist. It is obvious that any final conclusion is impossible until we have examined the non-Markan matter in the Third Gospel, both in itself and in its relation to Mk. Only if this material, or a very considerable portion of it, can be shown to constitute a continuous source, can we determine whether Mk. is the framework of the Third Gospel, or whether it is a storehouse from which the deficiencies of the non-Markan source have been made good. None the less, it is desirable to form an estimate of a provisional kind regarding St. Luke's use of Mk. The incompleteness of our conclusions will show what we must be able to find, if they are to stand.

We may summarize the treatment which Mk. has received at the hands of the Third Evangelist as follows:

Nearly half the opening chapter (Mk. i. 1–20) is cut away and replaced. A considerable portion (*Mk. i. 21–iii. 6*) is then taken over, but it is broken after i. 39 into two parts, the first describing a day in the life of Jesus (i. 21–39) and the second consisting mainly of stories of miracles and of controversy. Already there are signs that it is the substance rather than the frame of Mk. which is being utilized. For the Ministry of the Baptist, the Baptism, the Temptation of Jesus, and the Departure to Galilee, Mk. is passed by. The next portion of Mk. (iii. 7–30) is omitted. Parallels to all that is contained in this passage occur in the non-Markan parts of Lk., but these and the 'Markan Omissions' will be treated later. The next Markan stripe in Lk. is taken from *Mk. iii. 31–iv. 25*. Its first narrative is the Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus, the rest being almost entirely parabolic material. The fact that the story of the Visit is transferred to the end suggests that once more it is the character of the material used, rather than any movement or development in the course of events, which is the distinguishing feature of the section.

After omitting Mk. iv. 26–34, the Third Evangelist now adopts *Mk. iv. 35–vi. 44*. Again the Markan stripe is characterized by unity of subject-matter; it consists of 'wonder-stories',

the Storm on the Lake, the Gerasene Demoniac, the Raising of Jairus's Daughter, the Healing of the Woman with the Issue of Blood, and the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The only narratives which are not of this character are the Charge to the Twelve and the account of Herod's Curiosity. Even here, however, the healing aspect of the Charge receives greater emphasis in Lk.[1] than in Mk., while the Markan story of Herod is so modified that it becomes a story of the tetrarch's curiosity about the mighty works of Jesus rather than an account of his guilty fears. The only single narratives which St. Luke has omitted from this Markan section are the Visit of Jesus to Nazareth (Mk. vi. 1–6), for which he prefers his own version (Lk. iv. 16–30), and the story of the Daughter of Herodias (Mk. vi. 17–29). Although various motives have led to the neglect of these two narratives, the effect of their omission is to give greater unity to the Markan section as it appears in Lk.

There now follows what has been called St. Luke's 'Great Omission', the long passage, Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26, to which consideration will be given in the second part of the present chapter. After this section, an extensive use of Mk. is made in the passage *Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40*, from which nothing material is omitted except the short narrative in Mk. ix. 11–13 (The Conversation regarding the Coming of Elijah). It is not too much to say that until we come to this passage, the Markan sections used by St. Luke are adequately described as 'extracts'. At first sight, Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 would seem to be more than this, for the scene opens with Peter's Confession of the Messiahship of Jesus at Caesarea Philippi, and the section contains the story of the Transfiguration and the two prophecies of the Passion. For the first time in St. Luke's use of Mk. we appear to have the selection of a passage in which there is a real march of events. Here more than anywhere else there is ground for the view that Mk. is used as a primary source. It is remarkable, however, that in the Lukan parallel to Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 (Lk. ix. 18–50) the sense of movement and of development in the story is actually less apparent than in Mk. The Lukan account of Peter's Confession, which lacks the severe rebuke addressed by Jesus to that disciple, does

[1] Note the phrases in Lk., 'and to cure diseases', 'and to heal the sick', 'and healing everywhere' (Lk. ix. 1–6).

not sound that note of crisis, so evident in Mk., to anything like the same extent; while the Second Prophecy of the Passion in Lk. ix. 44 speaks only of the delivering up of Jesus, the pointed reference of the Markan passage (ix. 31) to killing and rising again being absent. Again, we have to remember the smaller degree of linguistic parallelism between Lk. and Mk. in some of the narratives of this section. In the case of the Transfiguration, the Epileptic Lad, and the Second Prediction of the Passion, the question is even raised whether St. Luke is entirely dependent upon his Markan source (see pp. 89–91). Further, it is of the greatest importance to notice the *place* to which Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 is assigned in the Second and Third Gospels. In Mk. it stands separated by little more than a single chapter from the Passion section in this Gospel (Mk. xi.–xvi.)—an arrangement which, in view of its subject-matter, is admirable. Quite different, however, is the position of the section corresponding to Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 in the Third Gospel (Lk. ix. 18–50). Here it is followed by St. Luke's so-called 'Greater Interpolation' (Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14). More than eight long chapters intervene before, in Lk. xix. 29–36 (The Story of the Obtaining of the Colt), we reach the point at which the Markan Passion section (Mk. xi.–xvi.) opens. These considerations make it somewhat precarious to suppose that in St. Luke's use of Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 we have at length lighted upon a case where the Markan document enters into the structure and ground-plan of the Third Gospel; the evidence points rather in the opposite direction. This opinion is strengthened when we remember a fact noted in Chapter III (p. 91 f.). In using Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 St. Luke has ignored (or suppressed) the indications in Mk. which point to movements outside Galilee. He does not mention Caesarea Philippi and he has omitted Mk. ix. 30 ('And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee'). Thus, in Lk., the parallel section is a Galilean section, and the natural inference is that Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 is taken over because of the interesting and important material it contains; the treatment accorded to it is that given to a secondary source rather than a foundation-document.

No other Markan section gives even the doubtful support of Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40 to the view that Mk. is St. Luke's principal source. Neglecting Mk. ix. 41–x. 12, to which there are parallels

in the non-Markan parts of his Gospel, St. Luke next makes use of *Mk. x. 13–xi. 8.* The only narrative which he omits is the Request of James and John (Mk. x. 35–45). Every narrative of Mk. x. 13–xi. 8 is a journey-story, but St. Luke has actually increased the unity of what he has borrowed by isolating the story of the Obtaining of the Colt, and by altering the time to which the Cure of the Blind Beggar is assigned relatively to the arrival at Jericho.[1] In other words, he has broken Mk. x. 13–xi. 8 into two parts, which are separated by his story of Zacchaeus and the Parable of the Pounds. The first consists of the four travel-stories of Mk. x. 13–34, which, *as St. Luke uses them*, belong to the period of the journey previous to the arrival at Jericho; the second part is Mk. xi. 1–8 (The Obtaining of the Colt), which is placed after the Parable of the Pounds and before the non-Markan version of the Exultation of the Disciples as the city came in sight. It is scarcely too much to say that the interest and homogeneity of the material used appears to be the motive guiding its selection.

Neglecting Mk. xi. 11–14 (The Entrance into Jerusalem and the Cursing of the Fig Tree), St. Luke next employs the Markan account of the Cleansing of the Temple, *Mk. xi. 15–17.* Mk. xi. 18–25 (The Priests' Plot, The Withering of the Fig Tree, and Sayings on Faith and Prayer) is also omitted, but all that follows in *Mk. xi. 27–xiii. 8* (with the exception of Mk. xii. 28–34, The Two Great Commandments) is closely reproduced. Mk. xi. 27–xiii. 8 presents yet another example of what we have already found. For the section in no way describes the march of events —in this respect it may be contrasted with Mk. xi. 11–14, 18–25, of which no use is made; it is a unity by reason of its subject-matter. Apart from the two narratives at the end (The Widow's Mites and the Discourse on the Fate of the Temple, &c.), its theme is the controversies between Jesus and His adversaries in Jerusalem; like Mk. i. 21–39, it describes a crucial day in the life of Jesus. The parts of Mk. which are used in the Lukan Eschatological Discourse and the Passion narrative do not call for further consideration here, for in these cases the conclusion has already been drawn that the Markan passages are 'extracts'

[1] Lk. xviii. 35: 'And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho.' Mk. x. 46: 'And they come to Jericho: and as he went out from Jericho.'

or 'insertions'; they supplement St. Luke's independent material. The only remaining Markan passage calling for notice is *Mk. xiv. 1–16*. From this section the Evangelist omits Mk. xiv. 3–9 (The Anointing at Bethany). The rest (The Priests' Plot, The Treachery of Judas, Preparations for the Passover) form an admirable introduction to the Lukan account of the Passion.

Reviewing the actual use which St. Luke has made of Mk., we may well ask, Is this the use which a writer might be expected to make of a primary source? Can we, with any consistency, describe as the framework of the Third Gospel a source from which the beginning (Mk. i. 1–20) is excised and the end (Mk. xiv. 17–xvi. 8) is practically neglected; from which blocks of material are cut out, each marked by some distinctive characteristic, either as describing important days in the life of Jesus (Mk. i. 21–39, xi. 27–xiii. 8), or as possessing unity of subject-matter, as, for example, the miraculous (Mk. i. 40–iii. 6, iv. 35–v. 43, vi. 30–44), parabolic teaching (iv. 1–25), incidents connected with Galilee (Mk. viii. 27–ix. 40), journey-stories (Mk. x. 13–xi. 8), and narratives leading up to the Passion Story (Mk. xiv. 1–16)? In thus using the Second Gospel, St. Luke is taking its flesh rather than its frame. Changing the figure, we may call him an excavator, a treasure-seeker. His search is for material, not for a foundation or ground-plan. It is easy to see the attractiveness of the view that the Second Gospel supplies the framework of the Third; St. Luke uses so much of Mk., and the latter is the earliest of the Synoptic Gospels! These facts are undoubted, but neither of them requires us to suppose that Mk. is St. Luke's principal source. The effect of our present investigation is to shake our confidence in this common assumption. *Mk. may be St. Luke's foundation-document, but his actual treatment does not suggest this; on the contrary, it resembles the use of a valued secondary source.*

This opinion is very much strengthened if our conclusions regarding the Lukan Passion narrative are accepted. If we are right in thinking that for his account of the Passion and Resurrection St. Luke has followed an independent written source, drawing merely a few extracts from Mk., this conclusion must of necessity react upon the problem as a whole. The part of Mk. which deals with the Passion is a very considerable one. In

space alone it forms no less than one-third of the entire Gospel, although it deals with the events of a single week. More important still, it is the crown and climax of that Gospel, the goal to which the whole story moves. It is certainly a remarkable use of a principal source which deserts it at its most vital part, culling from it a few fragments which are inserted into another source altogether. Demonstrably, this is not how the First Evangelist has used Mk., and there is no doubt that for Mt. the Second Gospel supplies form and framework. Here, as the story advances, Mk. is used not less but more, until in the story of the Passion Mt. is simply a revised version of Mk. The strangeness of St. Luke's procedure in the Passion narrative, on the assumption that Mk. is his main source in his Gospel as a whole, is not in itself a sufficient objection. But when we observe that this difficulty stands side by side with the facts elicited in our examination of the Markan sections in Lk. i.–xxi. 4, to say nothing of the Eschatological Discourse, the case becomes very much stronger. From the study of St. Luke's use of Mk. alone, we are entitled to conclude that it is precarious to suppose that Mk. is his principal source. It is important not to overstate this conclusion. What has just been said, however, seems to be a fair statement of the case. If we are to advance farther, we must consider the 'Markan Omissions', and then the question discussed in Chapter VI, the non-Markan sources used in the Third Gospel.

§ 2. *The 'Markan Omissions.'*

In considering St. Luke's 'Markan Omissions', we shall leave out of account verses and half-verses which have been omitted from Markan passages by the Third Evangelist for editorial and other similar reasons. The cases treated will be those of entire narratives and discourses to which either St. Luke has no parallel at all, or has obtained his parallel version from a non-Markan source. A full list of these 'Markan Omissions' must first be made. This will be found in the table below. In some cases it will be found that passages are included in view of results already attained in the earlier part of our investigation (e. g. the non-Markan character of Lk. vi. 12–19, xix. 37–40, 47 f., and the substance of Lk. xxi. 12–36 and xxii. 14–xxiv.).

List of Markan Passages omitted in the Third Gospel.

NOTE.—Parallel passages in Lk. are printed in the third column, where the symbols Q and L are added to indicate their nature and origin. Q = the Q Document. L. = St. Luke's 'peculiar' matter.

	Subject-matter.	*Parallel Passages in Lk.*
Mk. i. 1–20.		
1. i. 1.	Introduction.	i. 1–4. (L.)
2. i. 2–8.	The Ministry of the Baptist.	iii. 1–20. (Q and L.)
3. i. 9–11.	The Baptism of Jesus.	iii. 21–2. (Q.)
4. i. 12–13.	The Temptation of Jesus.	iv. 1–13. (Q.)
5. i. 14–15.	The Departure to Galilee.	iv. 14–15. (L.)
6. i. 16–20.	The Call of the First Disciples.	v. 1–11. (L.)
Mk. iii. 7–30.		
7. iii. 7–12.	Healings by the Seaside.	vi. 17–19. (Q or L.)
8. iii. 13–19.	The Appointment of the Twelve.	vi. 12–16. (Q or L.)
9. iii. 20–1.	The Attitude of the Family of Jesus.	—
10. iii. 22–7.	The Beelzebub Section.	xi. 14–23. (Q.)
11. iii. 28–30.	The Sin of Blasphemy.	xii. 10. (Q.)
Mk. iv. 26–34.		
12. iv. 26–9.	The Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly.	—
13. iv. 30–2.	The Parable of the Mustard Seed.	xiii. 18–19. (Q.)
14. iv. 33–4.	The Use of Parables.	—
Mk. vi. 1–6.		
15. vi. 1–6.	The Visit to Nazareth.	iv. 16–30. (L.)
Mk. vi. 17–29.		
16. vi. 17–29.	The Daughter of Herodias and the Death of John.	Cf. iii. 18–20. (L.)
Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 ('The Great Omission').		
17. vi. 45–52.	The Walking on the Water.	—
18. vi. 53–6.	Healings at Gennesaret.	—
19. vii. 1–13.	The Traditions of the Elders.	Cf. xi. 37–41. (Q.)
20. vii. 14–23.	On Defilement.	—
21. vii. 24–30.	The Syro-Phoenician Woman.	—
22. vii. 31–7.	The Cure of the Deaf Man with an Impediment in his Speech.	—
23. viii. 1–10.	The Feeding of the Four Thousand.	—
24. viii. 11–13.	Jesus refuses a Sign.	xi. 16, 29–30. (Q.)
25. viii. 14–21.	The Leaven of the Pharisees.	Cf. xii. 1. (L.)
26. viii. 22–6.	The Cure of the Blind Man at Bethsaida.	—
Mk. ix. 11–13.		
27. ix. 11–13.	The Coming of Elijah.	—

		Subject-matter.	*Parallel Passages in Lk.*	
Mk. ix. 41–x. 12.				
28.	ix. 41.	A Cup of Cold Water.	—	
29.	ix. 42–8.	On Offences.	xvii. 1–2.	(Q.)
30.	ix. 49–50.	Sayings about Salt.	xiv. 34–5.	(Q.)
31.	x. 1–12.	On Divorce and Adultery.	xvi. 18.	(Q.)
Mk. x. 35–45.				
32.	x. 35–40.	The Request of James and John.	—	
33.	x. 41–5.	Teaching about True Greatness.	xxii. 25–7.	(Q. ?)
Mk. xi. 9–14.				
34.	xi. 9–10.	The Approach to Jerusalem.	xix. 36–44.	(L.)
35.	xi. 11.	The Entry into Jerusalem and Departure to Bethany.	—	
36.	xi. 12–14.	The Cursing of the Fig Tree.	Cf. xiii. 6–9.	(L.)
Mk. xi. 18–25.				
37.	xi. 18.	Priests' Plot after the Cleansing.	xix. 47–8.	(L.)
38.	xi. 19.	Haunts of Jesus while at Jerusalem.	xxi. 37. (See p. 124 f.)	(L. ?)
39.	xi. 20–1.	The Withering of the Fig Tree.	—	
40.	xi. 22–3.	On Faith.	xvii. 5–6.	(Q.)
41.	xi. 24 f.	On Prayer.	—	
Mk. xii. 28–34.				
42.	xii. 28–34.	The Two Great Commandments.	x. 25–8.	(Q.)
Mk. xiii. 9–37. (except selections, see pp. 104 ff.).				
43.	xiii. 9–37	The Eschatological Discourse.	xxi. 12–36.	(L.)
Mk. xiv. 3–9.				
44.	xiv. 3–9.	The Anointing at Bethany.	vii. 36–50.	(L.)
Mk. xiv. 17–xvi. 8 (except selections, see pp. 35 ff.).				
45.	xiv. 17–xvi. 8.	The Passion and Resurrection narrative.	xxii. 14–xxiv.	(L.)

Some account must now be given of the causes which have led to the omission of so many important passages from the Markan source, and the substitution in some instances of parallel versions from other sources. In view of our earlier discussion in Chapters II and IV, there is no need to give further consideration to the Eschatological Discourse (No. 43) and the Passion and Resurrection narrative (No. 45). Nor is there any need to discuss Nos. 1, 14, 28, 38, and 41. These short passages have been omitted for editorial purposes, or because they have not been

thought sufficiently important.[1] Four other sections may safely be thought to have been omitted, either because their contents did not appeal to the Third Evangelist, or because he thought them unsuitable for his special purpose. These sections are No. 9 (The Attitude of the Family of Jesus), No. 12 (The Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly), No. 16 (The Daughter of Herodias), No. 27 (The Coming of Elijah). Similar suggestions may justly be made regarding the omission of many other sections in the list, but it is doubtful if in these cases we have more than a partial explanation of St. Luke's neglect of the Markan version. These sections fall into three classes, to each of which separate consideration must be given. They include: (1) The 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26), (2) Instances in which St. Luke has used Q and not Mk., (3) Narratives in respect of which preference has been given to a non-Markan version.

1. *The 'Great Omission'* (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26).

Four reasons have been advanced for this omission, (*a*) that the entire passage is a later insertion in Mk.,[2] (*b*) that it has been accidentally omitted by St. Luke,[3] (*c*) that its omission in the Third Gospel was intentional,[4] (*d*) that St. Luke used a mutilated copy of Mk. in which vi. 47 b–viii. 27 a was lacking.[5]

Sir John Hawkins dismisses the first view in consequence of the linguistic evidence, lexical and grammatical. He holds that this is sufficient 'to establish a moral certainty that this part of Mk. was drawn up by the same author or editor as the rest of the Gospel' (*O.S.S.*, p. 66). Streeter's suggestion (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 176 ff.) of a mutilated copy of Mk. escapes this difficulty, and accounts for certain peculiarities in St. Luke's narratives of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and Peter's Confession.[6] By its

[1] In the case of No. 38 (The Haunts of Jesus while at Jerusalem), it may be that Lk. xxi. 37 is an editorial passage depending on Mk. xi. 19. See p. 124 f.

[2] By Wright, Williams, *O.S.S.*, pp. 417 ff., Holdsworth, *Gospel Origins*, p. 154 f., Loisy (in part), Spitta, Wendling, Stanton (in part).

[3] By J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the NT.*, pp. 81–3, and Hawkins (in part).

[4] By Wernle, von Soden, Sanday, Loisy (in part), Moffatt, Wellhausen, Hawkins (in part), Stanton (in part).

[5] By Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 176 ff.

[6] e.g. the fact that St. Luke places the Feeding of the Five Thousand at Bethsaida (Mk., 'a desert place'), the omission of the place-name Caesarea

nature, however, a mutilation-theory cannot be proved. Nor does it provide a better explanation than the theory of intentional omission, especially if, as Streeter suggests, we find reason to explain the Markan passages not included in Lk. as 'non-insertions' rather than 'omissions'.[1]

Hawkins finds the cause of the omission in a combination of the two hypotheses of accident and intention.[2] Stanton (*G.H.D.*, ii. 156 ff.) also thinks the omission is intentional, but he is of the opinion that a considerable part of the section consists of later insertions in Mk.[3] For his proposed reconstruction of the original Markan document Stanton is able to present a strong case, but the argument that linguistic considerations establish 'a moral certainty' that Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 was drawn up by the author or editor of Mk. is too formidable to be ignored. It is not possible, therefore, to accept the proposed reconstruction, unless we look upon the insertions as having been made subsequently to St. Luke's use of Mk., a view which Hawkins ranks as no more than a bare possibility. Both Hawkins and Stanton rightly agree in invoking the theory of intentional omission. The truth of the matter is well summed up by Dr. James Moffatt, when he writes: 'The weight of evidence tells in favour of the hypotheses which assume that Luke, for some reason or other, passed over matter which lay before him' (*I.N.T.*, p. 628).

Philippi as the scene of Peter's Confession (ix. 18), the statement that Jesus was 'praying alone' on that occasion (cf. Mk. vi. 46), the reading of B in Lk. ix. 18 ('they met' for 'they were with'). Cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 176 ff.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 179. Cf. also p. 214: 'To Luke, Mark was a supplementary source, from which, if pressed for space, he would refrain from extracting material which seemed to him of subordinate interest.'

[2] Cf. *O.S.S.*, p. 74: 'Possibly, indeed, the truth of the case may lie in a combination of the two hypotheses of accident and intention: that is to say, Lk. may first have missed this division of Mk. by opening his MS. at the wrong place, as above suggested, and in that case, even if he afterwards discovered the mistake and examined the omitted matter, it might seem to him that none of it was so necessary or even suitable for his special purposes that he would care to go back and repair the omission by any subsequent insertions.'

[3] The original Markan document is thought to have included vii. 24–31 (The Syro-Phoenician Woman's Daughter), vii. 32–7 (The Deaf Man), viii. 11–13, 15 (The Pharisees' Demand for a Sign), and viii. 22–6 (The Blind Man at Bethsaida). Stanton suggests that the first two and the last were omitted because of the unsuitability of their contents, and the Pharisees' Demand because St. Luke had a parallel version in his Logian document (Lk. xi. 16, 29 f.).

For the motives which led to the omission of the separate narratives of Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 there is naturally room for differences of opinion. No satisfactory solution of the problem, however, can be looked for along these lines. What is needed is a motive accounting for the neglect of the section *as a whole*.[1] In default of this, the explanations of the 'Great Omission' have a somewhat strained look; and, in point of fact, both Hawkins and Stanton have felt the need of supplementing the theory of intentional omission—Hawkins by combining it with the theory of accidental omission, Stanton by the addition of the theory of subsequent insertions in Mk. Can we, then, explain the omission of Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 as a whole? It is not too much to say that so long as we treat Mk. as St. Luke's primary source, no satisfactory answer to this question is forthcoming. The view that the section belongs to Deutero-Mark is the most logical explanation on this assumption, but, in view of the linguistic phenomena (*vide* Hawkins), it is difficult in the extreme to look upon Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 as a later insertion. Thus, we are driven to ask whether it is right to think that Mk. is St. Luke's principal authority, and whether the 'Great Omission' is not more satisfactorily accounted for when we dissent from this assumption. It is impossible to pursue this question farther at the present stage of our inquiry; it will be taken up again when the non-Markan sections in Lk. have been examined. The fact, however, that the problem of the 'Great Omission' does not receive a satisfactory solution, so long as we confine our attention to Mk., is in itself of very great importance.

2. *Instances in which St. Luke has used Q and not Mk.*

The following passages in the list on page 136 f. were probably passed by in favour of the Q version:

No. 2. The Ministry of the Baptist.
No. 3. The Baptism of Jesus.
No. 4. The Temptation of Jesus.
No. 10. The Beelzebub Section.

[1] 'But, even if we could give good reasons for the omission of each of the seventy-four verses separately, that would not explain how they came to be omitted *en bloc*. The coincidence would really be too extraordinary' (J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the NT*, p. 82 f.).

No. 11. The Sin of Blasphemy.
No. 13. The Parable of the Mustard Seed.
No. 24. Jesus refuses a Sign.
No. 29. On Offences.
No. 30. Sayings about Salt.
No 31. On Divorce and Adultery.
No. 40. On Faith.
No. 42. The Two Great Commandments.

As a rule, St. Luke's preference for the Q version of these narratives and sayings is felt to be a sufficient explanation of his neglect of Mk. This view, however, fails to do full justice to the facts of the case. For in the Third Gospel the Q version does not merely replace the Markan; on the contrary, it frequently stands in a different context, and is associated with other Q matter and with material peculiar to Lk. This, as Streeter has observed, is especially the case in the Beelzebub Section, the Parable of the Mustard Seed, and the Two Great Commandments.[1] St. Luke's procedure is not simply the choice of one version of an incident or discourse instead of another version; the preference is one of *sources*; higher regard is paid to Q than to Mk.

3. *Other Markan Passages, mainly Narratives, in respect of which preference has been given to Non-Markan Versions.*

The passages in question are as follows:

No. 5. The Departure to Galilee.
No. 6. The Call of the First Disciples.
No. 7. Healings by the Seaside.
No. 8. The Appointment of the Twelve.
No. 15. The Visit to Nazareth.
No. 33. Teaching about True Greatness.
No. 34. The Approach to Jerusalem.
No. 35. The Entry into Jerusalem and Departure to Bethany.
No. 36. The Cursing of the Fig Tree.
No. 37. The Priests' Plot after the Cleansing.
No. 39. The Withering of the Fig Tree.
No. 44. The Anointing at Bethany.

[1] See Chapter I, p. 24.

In respect of these sections the Lukan parallels are of two kinds:

(*a*) There are cases in which St. Luke has preferred to take a *parallel* version from a non-Markan source. These include Nos. 6, 15, and 34, and probably Nos. 5, 7, 8, and 37.

(*b*) There are cases in which the Markan story is omitted because of a *similar*, but not necessarily a parallel, non-Markan passage. Such instances are found in Nos. 33 (with which No. 32, The Request of James and John, is connected), 36, 39, and 44.

(*a*) As regards the former class, it will be seen that the more important parallels (Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 15) do not merely replace the corresponding Markan version, but appear in the Third Gospel in a different order and connexion. They are like the Q passages which have just been discussed. It has yet to be determined, however, whether we can speak of the non-Markan parts of Lk. as constituting a non-Markan source. If this should prove to be possible, then the narratives we are now discussing will not be simply cases in which one narrative is preferred to another; as before, they will furnish signs which indicate the Third Evangelist's estimate of his sources. If, for example, the story of the Sermon at Nazareth (Lk. iv. 16–30) is an integral part of a non-Markan source which is preserved in Lk., St. Luke's omission of the parallel narrative in Mk. vi. 1–6 (No. 15, The Visit to Nazareth) shows that he treats Mk. as a secondary source. The preference is one of sources, and not merely of narratives.

(*b*) Precisely the same is true of the second class. If the narrative of the Woman in the City (Lk. vii. 36–50) is not merely an isolated story, but a unit in an organic whole, then the Third Evangelist's neglect of the account of the Anointing at Bethany (No. 44, Mk. xiv. 3–9) will indicate that it is a non-Markan source and not the Markan which is his primary authority. Once more, it will be seen, we are dependent upon the investigation yet to be undertaken of the non-Markan sections of the Third Gospel. The problem cannot be solved by considering Mk. alone. In one narrative, however, a further step can be taken now. This is the account of *the Approach to*

and Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. We may, in the light of our previous investigation, describe St. Luke's procedure as follows. While he reproduces the Markan story of the Obtaining of the Colt, he replaces the account of the Approach to Jerusalem (No. 34) by a non-Markan version (Lk. xix. 36–44), and entirely omits the climax of the whole—the Markan reference to the Entry into the City (No. 35, Mk. xi. 11). So, at any rate, we must describe his procedure if Mk. is his primary source. We have only to state such a use of sources, however, to be struck with its inherent improbability. It is a far more natural account of the existing phenomena to suppose that St. Luke's primary source was a non-Markan document or tradition, which described, not a Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, but rather the Exultation of the Disciples as the city came into view; and that, at a later time, St. Luke has added to this version, as a kind of preface, the Markan story of the Obtaining of the Colt. Whatever be the case elsewhere, in this incident the Markan element is secondary.

In the case of the first and third divisions into which we have divided the 'Markan Omissions' we reach much the same result —a postponement of the problem until attention has been given to the non-Markan sections in Lk. Probably the same ought to be said with regard to the second division, the cases in which St. Luke has preferred to use the Q version, for the Third Evangelist's use of Q is a question which requires fuller consideration. These topics will concern us in Chapters VI and VII, and when they have been treated it will be necessary to return to the problem of the 'Markan Omissions' in the course of Chapter VIII. It is, however, fair to say, even at the present stage of our inquiry, that the omission of so considerable a portion of St. Mark's Gospel, dependent for its explanation upon factors outside that Gospel, raises a question of great difficulty for all who hold that Mk. is St. Luke's primary source. On that assumption, the explanation of these omissions is not easy so long as we treat the non-Markan parallels as isolated passages; it will break down completely once a continuous non-Markan source is proved to exist.

VI

ST. LUKE'S USE OF Q

THUS far, our attention has been mainly confined to St. Luke's use of Mk. In passing on to consider his use of non-Markan sources, we are not turning from the known to the unknown, but we are certainly moving from the treatment of the well known to the consideration of the less known; and this is the true course of a scientific investigation. A tempting method of procedure would be at once to classify and examine the existing non-Markan sections in the Third Gospel and to discuss any unity which they may appear to have. Are they sundered parts of a common source, and in what relation do they stand to the Markan sections? There is, however, a preliminary question—the problem of *St. Luke's use of Q.* Even if we had to think of Q as an oral source, its use by St. Luke would still remain a proper object for inquiry, and so far as our present investigation is concerned, the discussion of St. Luke's use of Q is indispensable, as preliminary to the consideration of any 'special source' embedded in the Third Gospel.

The best method of treatment will be to examine separately the four sections of the Third Gospel in which Q matter appears. These sections are: (*a*) Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30; (*b*) Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3; (*c*) Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14; (*d*) Lk. xix. 1–28. Outside these passages nothing in Lk. has been taken from Q, with the possible exception of the saying in Lk. xxii. 30 b ('And ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'). When these sections have been examined, it should then be possible to draw certain broad conclusions regarding the manner in which St. Luke has made use of Q.

EVANGELICAL SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

§ 1. *An Examination of the Manner in which Q has been used by the Third Evangelist.*

(*A*) *Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30.*

The contents of the section are indicated in the following table[1]:

1.	The Preaching of John the Baptist.	iii. 1–20.
2.	The Baptism of Jesus.	iii. 21–2.
3.	The Genealogy of Jesus.	iii. 23–38.
4.	The Temptation of Jesus.	iv. 1–13.
5.	The Departure to Galilee.	iv. 14–15.
6.	The Sermon at Nazareth.	iv. 16–30.

This section has already been reviewed in Chapter III (p. 76 f.) so far as its relation to Mk. is concerned. The conclusion there adopted was that, apart from minor editorial additions, of which the phrase 'preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins' is the chief, the entire section is non-Markan in origin; it consists of Q matter which is fused with material peculiar to Lk.

The derivation of the story of the Temptation from Q is very widely accepted; the passage occurs in no less than ten of the reconstructions of Q which are detailed by Moffatt in his *Introduction*.[2] Less support has been forthcoming for the Logian origin of the Baptism of Jesus, but the arguments of B. H. Streeter leave little room for doubt that here Mt. and Lk. rest upon Q rather than on Mk.[3] As regards the Preaching of John the Baptist, Lk. iii. 7–9, 17 is assigned to Q by all who admit that this source contained matter prefatory to the account of the

[1] In this and the following table passages probably derived from Q are underlined.

[2] *I.N.T.*, pp. 197 ff.

[3] 'Since Q recorded John's preaching and the Temptation it would be very strange if no mention were made of the Baptism, which is the connecting link between the two. The hypothesis that Q had some account of it receives some confirmation when we notice that Matthew and Luke agree in saying "the heavens were opened" (ἀνοίγω). Mk. has "He saw the heavens torn asunder" (σχιζομένους). Further, if we accept as original the well-attested "Western" reading of Lk. iii. 22 . . . ("Thou art my Beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee"), we can assign no other reason for St. Luke preferring this version to that we find in Mark . . . except that he found it in Q (cf. Harnack)' (*O.S.S.*, p. 187).

Great Sermon. Lk. iii. 7–9, 17, however, represents a minimum debt to Q, and Streeter is justified in extending St. Luke's indebtedness to Lk. iii. 3–4 and 16. We may therefore describe the Q element in the section as follows:

The Preaching of John the Baptist.	iii. 3–4, 7–9, 16–17.
The Baptism of Jesus.	iii. 21–2.
The Temptation of Jesus.	iv. 1–13.

The advantage of the table is that it permits us to observe the treatment to which Q has been subjected in the section under review. What that treatment is, admits of little doubt. *In this section the Q matter constitutes a framework into which non-Markan material has been fitted in such a way as to secure a vivid, continuous narrative.* In order to show this, it will be best to pass in rapid review the contents of the section.

Lk. iii. opens with a sixfold date, defining the time when John the son of Zacharias began his work as a prophet of righteousness in the country about the Jordan. This date introduces an excerpt from Q, in which John is described as coming in the fulfilment of prophecy. His work is that of a forerunner; he is a voice crying in the wilderness bidding men to prepare the way of the Lord. No personal description of the man is attempted, but attention is immediately drawn to the substance of his preaching. First his words to the multitudes which came to be baptized are given. The people are addressed in stern, uncompromising terms. They are the offspring of vipers. Who was it who had warned them to flee from the coming wrath? Let them bring forth the fruits of righteousness, and let them not plead pride of birth. Even now the axe is lying at the root. A time of judgement is coming when barren trees will be hewn down and burned.

A passage now follows (iii. 10–14) which no one assigns to Q; it is part of the matter peculiar to Lk. The passage gives the Baptist's answers to the questions put by certain classes of his hearers, and the natural manner in which it is related to its context is manifest at a glance. The multitudes are bidden to perform acts of service, the publicans to avoid extortion, and the soldiers to refrain from violence and to be content with their wages.

The Evangelist now returns to the Q passage (iii. 16–17) which

defines the Baptist's testimony. This is skilfully introduced by an editorial passage (iii. 15) in which the expectations and reasonings of the people are mentioned. John's claim is represented as the answer to the surmise of the crowd. While he himself baptizes them with water, there is coming One mightier than he, whose work it will be to baptize them with the Holy Spirit and with fire. The task of the Coming One is that of judgement. His hand grasps a fan with which to sift the hearts of men. The wheat he will gather into his barn, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire. The section is rounded off by an editorial summary in a characteristically Lukan manner: 'With many other exhortations therefore preached he good tidings unto the people; but Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the evil things which Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison' (iii. 18–20). At first sight, it seems rather surprising that, before telling of the Baptism of Jesus, St. Luke should speak of the imprisonment of John. But to anticipate events, and to complete the story so far as it concerns the agent immediately in question, is not infrequently St. Luke's literary method.

We now come to the story of the Baptism of Jesus (iii. 21–2). No mention is made of the coming of Jesus and of any request of His for baptism; on the contrary, He is introduced into the narrative very abruptly.[1] He appears in the act of undergoing baptism, and in one breath, so to speak, we are told that the heaven opened as He prayed. The description of the descent of the Spirit 'in a bodily form, as a dove' probably contains an interpretative element which St. Luke has introduced into his source.

St. Luke has now brought the central figure of Jesus into his story, and accordingly, having mentioned His age, he proceeds from some unknown source to give His genealogy (iii. 23–38). It will be seen how natural is the place assigned to the Genealogy in a source conceived as beginning with iii. 1. The Genealogy is followed by the story of the Temptation, where the Satanic suggestion that Jesus should cast Himself down from

[1] One is reminded of the similarly abrupt manner in which Saul first appears in the Acts (vii. 58).

the pinnacle of the temple is placed last—probably a sign of editorial rearrangement. Once more the hand of St. Luke is seen in the final sentence: 'And when the devil had completed every temptation, he departed from him for a season' (iv. 13).

St. Luke has now used his last portion of Q matter in this section of his Gospel, but the story continues to march forward in the most natural manner. Leaving the wilderness, Jesus sets out for Galilee (iv. 14–15). As in the introduction to the story of the Temptation, so here Jesus goes in the power of the Spirit. His departure is not, as in Mk., associated with the imprisonment of John. In a few brief phrases, which remind one of similar passages in the Acts, an undefined period of successful synagogue preaching is described. 'And a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.' What is thus summarily described is then focused by an exceedingly vivid and picturesque account of the preaching of Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth (iv. 16–30). The attractiveness and beauty of this narrative must not be allowed to obscure the fact that it owes its position in St. Luke's story to choice and design. It is not accident that the first detailed story of the Galilean ministry, as it is told in the Third Gospel, throws into the foreground the thought of God as the God of Gentiles as well as of Jews, as the Friend of sinners, the Healer of the broken-hearted, and the Giver of light. The story also pictures in the most vivid way the hostility awakened by preaching greeted at first with so much eagerness and delight. Thus the narrative stands in a natural and intelligible relation to all that has gone before, and reveals the unity of the Lukan story from iii. 1 onwards.

The section has been examined with considerable fullness in order to display the intimate relation which exists within it between matter derived from Q and material peculiar to the Third Gospel. *The backbone of the section is clearly furnished by Q.* But material is not merely abstracted and reproduced from Q; it is expanded, and is introduced and rounded off by editorial comments and summaries. Narratives of a non-Markan character are added in such a way as to produce a story which carries us swiftly from the excited crowds which poured out to hear the preaching of John to the enthusiastic opening of the

Galilean ministry of Jesus, a bright morning already streaked by the promise of tragedy. It may be that St. Luke was furnished with an already expanded version of Q, or it may be that the compilation is entirely his own work. It may even be that both these processes lie behind the record. These are matters which cannot yet be decided. In any case, the section is a self-consistent narrative-passage whose debt to Mk. is practically negligible.

(*B*) *Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3.*

The contents of this section are shown in the table below.

1.	The Choice of the Apostles.	vi. 12–16.
2.	Many Miracles of Healing.	vi. 17–19.
3.	The Great Sermon.	vi. 20–49.
4.	The Healing of the Centurion's Servant.	vii. 1–10.
5.	The Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain.	vii. 11–17.
6.	The Message of the Baptist and the Reply of Jesus.	vii. 18–23.
7.	The Words of Jesus regarding John.	vii. 24–30.
8.	The Saying on Children playing in the Market-place.	vii. 31–5.
9.	The Story of the Woman in the City who was a Sinner.	vii. 36–50.
10.	A Preaching Tour of Jesus ; Ministering Women.	viii. 1–3.

As before, we shall swiftly pass in review the contents of this section, in order to show the close manner in which extracts from Q and non-Markan matter are woven together.

The non-Markan character of the first two narratives was discussed in Chapter III (pp. 81–3). Here it is sufficient to note the excellent manner in which they lead up to the Great Sermon. The Sermon itself is probably given as it stood in Q,[1] though the possibility that it has received some degree of editorial treatment may be left open. First, we have four classes of those who are pronounced 'blessed'; then four 'woes'. A section next follows on the attitude which is to be taken up towards enemies (vi. 27–9), towards those in need (30), and towards men in general (31). These injunctions are expounded in the succeeding passage (32–5), in which the insufficiency of love towards those who already love us is treated. With verse 36 a new series

[1] Cf. Streeter, *O.S.S.*, pp. 147–9.

of commands begins: On being merciful (36); On not judging (37); On not condemning (37); On forgiving (37, 38). The parabolic saying on the blind leading the blind (39) is intended to show the importance of these virtues in the case of the disciples who are to be leaders. In this respect, the disciple is not above his master (40). The question of judging is resumed in verses 41–2. Verses 43–6 contain detached sayings on good and corrupt trees (43, 44), on good and evil men (45), and on the insufficiency of profession without practice (46). With the similitude of the two men who built their houses, one upon the rock and the other upon sand, the Sermon concludes (47–9). It is followed by an editorial passage which leads on to the story of the Healing of the Centurion's Servant: 'After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, he entered into Capernaum' (vii. 1).

While Lk. vii. 1–10 is clearly dependent on the same source as that on which Mt. viii. 5–13 depends, there are material differences between the two narratives. It is probable that the Lukan version represents the story of the Centurion's Servant as it appeared in Q, but interpreted and supplemented by information or tradition to which the Third Evangelist had access.

St. Luke closely relates the non-Markan incident which follows (The Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain) to the preceding Q passage by the summary statement: 'And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went to a city called Nain; and his disciples went with him, and a great multitude.' Just as significant is the connexion of the incident with the Q extract which follows. Without disputing the probability that in his researches St. Luke found authority for the temporal statement just quoted, we may ascribe the reason for introducing the story of the Widow's Son at this point to the terms of the Reply of Jesus to the Baptist's Message (cf. verse 22, 'the dead are raised up').

The story of the Baptist's Message is followed by the Words of Jesus regarding John, which is also taken from Q. The latter is sewn on to the saying on Children playing in the Market-place (Q) by the editorial statement: 'And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers

rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him' (vii. 29 f.). This discourse is followed by the Lukan story of the Woman in the City who was a Sinner. Once more a link is easily discernible between Q matter and material peculiar to Lk. Jesus has just been comparing His ministry with that of John. John came neither eating nor drinking; He Himself came eating and drinking, and men call Him 'a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners'. No more suitable place could have been chosen for such a narrative as Lk. vii. 36–50, telling, as it does, of Christ's dealings with a woman who was a sinner on an occasion when He was eating and drinking. The concluding narrative in the section is connected with the story of the Woman in the City by the words: 'And it came to pass soon afterwards that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God.' It tells of a preaching tour which Jesus undertook, accompanied by the Twelve and certain women who 'ministered unto them of their substance'.

We have now reached the end of the section, which is precisely like the earlier section. Q supplies the foundation, and into it editorial passages and matter peculiar to Lk. are inserted at suitable points.

(*C*) *Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14.*

In this section we shall find features like those already noted, but we shall also find interesting differences. At the beginning Q furnishes the framework, but towards the middle a change is discernible. The bulk of Q has been used, but the greater part of St. Luke's 'peculiar' matter is still available, and it is into the contexts supplied by this material that sayings from Q are introduced. It will be best first to attempt a rapid summary of the section, and then to examine its literary construction in greater detail.

(*a*) The place of the story of the Samaritan Village (as a journey-story) is clearly determined by the Q material which it introduces (The Candidates for Discipleship and the Mission Address).

(*b*) The same is true of the Return of the Seventy.

(*c*) The place of the Parable of the Good Samaritan is prepared for by the Q passage on the Two Great Commandments.

(*d*) No good reason can be given for the introduction of the story of Martha and Mary at the point where it appears. It is loosely connected with its context by a journey-reference: 'Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village.'

(*e*) The Parable of the Friend at Midnight has its position determined by the Q passages on prayer which it separates.

(*f*) 'Blessed is the womb.' This incident follows effectively after the victory of Jesus over His adversaries (cf. the Beelzebub Controversy, and the Unclean Spirit).

(*g*) The section On Dividing the Inheritance and the Parable of the Rich Fool are given an admirable position in view of the Q passage which follows (On Over-anxiety).

(*h*) The thread of continuity in the case of the Galileans, the Tower of Siloam and the Fig Tree, and the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity is not clear. In the case of the latter the way is prepared for the Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven by the closing words: '. . . his adversaries were put to shame: and all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.'

(*i*) The saying 'That Fox' and the reference to Jerusalem prepare the way for the Q saying, 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem'. It may be, however, that the relationship should be reversed. This is a possibility which arises from Lk. xiii. onwards.

(*j*) The Dropsical Man and the Man invited to a Banquet. Both are associated with meals, and are brought into connexion with the Parable of the Great Supper.

(*k*) The Lukan section on the Price of Discipleship is thoroughly congruous with the Q matter in which it is found (On Hating Kinsfolk, On Cross-Bearing, and Savourless Salt).

(*l*) The excellent position of the Parables of the Lost Coin and the Lost Son after the Parable of the Lost Sheep—ultimately derived from Q—speaks for itself. It is possible that the Lost Coin is taken from Q.

(*m*) The Q passage, On Serving Two Masters, is loosely appended to the Lukan Parable of the Unjust Steward. This parable, the reference to the Pharisees who were lovers of money, and the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus have community of subject-matter (the use and love of money). The position of the Three Short Sayings is not capable of a satisfactory explanation.

(*n*) The relation of the Farmer and his Man to the three Q passages which go before (On Offences, On Forgiveness, and On Faith as a Grain of Mustard Seed) appears to be indicated in the closing words: 'Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do' (xvii. 10). The parable corrects the outlook which finds something extraordinary in the commands regarding forgiveness and faith (cf. Moffatt, *Expositor*, Jan., 1922).

(*o*) The position of the story of the Ten Lepers is determined by the

geographical reference in the opening words: 'And it came to pass, as they were on the way to Jerusalem, that he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee' (xvii. 11).

(*p*) The saying 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation' prepares the way for the Q passage, the Coming of the Son of Man.

(*q*) The Parable of the Unjust Judge—with its reference to the need of constancy in prayer—is closely connected with the Coming of the Son of Man. Note the reference to the elect in verse 7 and the question of verse 8.

(*r*) The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, like that of the Unjust Judge, deals with the subject of prayer.

These brief notes indicate, but do not adequately reveal the literary relationship between the Lukan and the Logian sections of Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14, and for the purpose of observing this relationship a more detailed examination is necessary. Like Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 and Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3, the section is knitted together so as to form a continuous narrative. Successive paragraphs are frequently brought into close connexion (e. g. xi. 27, 37, 53, xii. 1, 13, xiii. 1, 31, xvi. 14, &c.), and many references are made to the journeying of Jesus (ix. 51, 57, x. 38, xiii. 22, xiv. 25, xvii. 11). The section will be covered best if we examine in order the parts into which it naturally falls.

(*a*) *Lk. ix. 51–x. 24.* The central element in this passage is the Mission of the Seventy. Preceded by the story of the Samaritan Village, and the passage on the Candidates for Discipleship, it is followed by the Mission Address, the Return of the Seventy, and the Rejoicing of Jesus. Thus Lk. ix. 51–x. 24, which is really a fusion of Lukan elements and of material from Q, forms a unity in itself.

(*b*) *Lk. x. 25–42*, in like manner, is a literary whole. The story of the lawyer's question is looked upon as an incident in the missionary activity of Jesus, and provides the opportunity for relating the Parable of the Good Samaritan. The following narrative, the Visit to the Village of Martha and Mary, is slenderly connected with the rest by the reference to travel in the opening words: 'Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village.'

(*c*) *Lk. xi. 1–13* deals with the subject of prayer. In the remark that Jesus was praying in a certain place when His disciples came to Him, a further attempt to introduce a narrative

element into the material utilized is evident. The insertion of the Parable of the Friend at Midnight between the version of the Lord's Prayer and the rest of the teaching regarding prayer has already been noticed above.

(*d*) *Lk. xi. 14–28* is also a unity. Its opening passage on the Healing of a Dumb Demoniac lent itself for usage in connexion with a journey-narrative, while the story of the Woman in the Crowd who cried, 'Blessed is the womb', &c., crowns the dialectical victory of Jesus over those who explained His power by the cry, 'By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth he out devils'.

(*e*) *Lk. xi. 29–xii. 59* contains material which, with the exception of xii. 13–21 (On Dividing the Inheritance, and the Parable of the Rich Fool), is almost entirely taken from Q. Such material does not always readily lend itself to narrative treatment, but this is effected here by the reference to thronging multitudes at the beginning (xi. 29) and the reference to an invitation to a Pharisee's house, which introduces the Woes on Pharisees and Lawyers. The latter section is closed by the words: 'And when he was come out from thence, the scribes and the Pharisees began to press upon him vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things; laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth' (xi. 53 f.). The collection of sundry sayings in xii. 2–12 is introduced by a graphic reference to the pressing crowds of people who 'trode one upon another' in their eagerness (xii. 1). As we have seen, the Parable of the Rich Fool prepares the way for the section on Over-anxiety (xii. 22–34), which again, by its concluding reference to treasure (xii. 33 f.), leads on to the sayings on the need for watchfulness (xii. 35–48). The presence of the catena of sayings in xii. 49–59 can only be explained by the view that they appeared in Q at this point, and that they have been taken over bodily. An attempt to impose a narrative form may perhaps be found in the words: 'And he said to the multitudes also' (xii. 54): but it is just as likely in this case that the words appeared already in Q.

(*f*) *Lk. xiii.* From this point onwards Q matter enters less into the structure and ground-plan of the Lukan narrative. The greater part of Q has now been used, and, with the exception of the section on the Coming of the Son of Man (xvii. 22–37) and

the Parables of the Great Supper (xiv. 15–24) and the Pounds (xix. 11–28), what remains consists of single sayings, or short groups of sayings, unconnected with definite incidents. On the other hand, the greater part of St. Luke's 'special matter', consisting of parables, incidents, and sayings, has not yet been used. The Evangelist's procedure is to maintain the background of journeying and teaching, to draw more freely upon his 'special matter', and to insert at appropriate points the Q material which remains. In Lk. xiii. he begins with the sayings regarding the Galileans slain by Pilate and the eighteen killed by the fall of the tower in Siloam, together with the Parable of the Fig Tree—sections which, from their emphasis upon the note of warning, have community of subject-matter. The story of the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity (xiii. 10–17) opens with a reference to synagogue-teaching, and its concluding words, which record the triumph of Jesus over His adversaries and the rejoicing of the multitude, in a measure prepare the way for the Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven. The two following sections, the Strait Gate and the Door Shut, are introduced by the words: 'And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem' (xiii. 22). The section ends with the cry, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem', which is prefaced by the sardonic remark, 'for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (xiii. 33).

(*g*) *Lk. xiv. 1–24* is a well-knit passage, which consists of three parts, connected by references to meals. The Healing of the Dropsical Man (xiv. 1–6) takes place on the Sabbath day in the house of a Pharisee, which Jesus has entered to eat bread. Out of this incident arises the teaching, first as to the deportment of a man invited to a banquet (xiv. 7–11), and secondly as regards the kind of people to be summoned to a dinner (xiv. 12–14). This material precedes the Parable of the Great Supper (xiv. 15–24), which is introduced by the comment of one who sat at meat with Jesus, 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God'. If this parable is from Q, it is another instance of the way in which such material is now made to depend on the Evangelist's 'special matter'.

(*h*) *Lk. xiv. 25–35* is prefaced by the words: 'Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned, and said unto

them . . .' The subject of the section is Discipleship and the Duty of Counting the Cost. The two opening sayings, On Hating Kinsfolk, Brethren, &c., and On Cross-bearing, are probably taken from Q. If so, they appear to be cited at this point to introduce the two Lukan semi-parables, On Building a Tower (xiv. 28–30) and On Going to War (xiv. 31–2). These sayings are clinched by the words, 'So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple', and it is evident that it is by attraction to these words that the Q saying on Savourless Salt (xiv. 34–5) owes its position.

(*i*) *Lk. xv.–xvii. 10.* This section consists of parabolic matter, into which a few sayings, probably from Q, are inserted. As in earlier instances, the parables are set within the itinerant ministry of Jesus. Reference is made to the approaching crowds, which include publicans and sinners and hostile scribes and Pharisees. As we shall see, it is the Pharisees who stand out most prominently, and who foreshadow the tragic sequel to the preaching ministry. Even in the case of the Parable of the Unjust Steward, which is addressed to the disciples, we are not allowed to lose sight of the Pharisees, for the parable is followed by the words: 'And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things; and they scoffed at him.' The first three parables, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son, are introduced by the objection of the scribes and Pharisees, 'This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them' (xv. 2). In view of the linguistic parallels with Mt. xviii. 12–14, it may be that the Parable of the Lost Sheep was taken from Q, and the same may also be true of the Parable of the Lost Coin, though here the evidence is slight. If the evidence is deemed sufficient, we have, in the case of the Parable of the Lost Son, another instance of a Lukan parable added to matter taken from Q. A saying, probably from Q (On Serving Two Masters, xvi. 13), is appended to the fourth parable, the Unjust Steward (xvi. 1–12). The position of the three sayings from Q in xvi. 16–18 almost defies explanation. They neither illuminate their context, nor are they explained by it, and any attempt at exposition can only be tentative in the extreme. The sayings are as follows:

xvi. 16. 'The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it.'

xvi. 17. 'But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall.'

xvi. 18. 'Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.'

These sayings are preceded by the rebuke to the Pharisees: 'Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God' (xvi. 15). It may be the fact that the Pharisees were pre-eminently those who exalted the law, which accounts for the introduction of the first saying. 'The law and the prophets', says Jesus, 'were until John.' Since John, however, a new and a living way is open in the good news of the kingdom, which men are taking as if by storm. The saying which follows, on the Permanence of the Precepts of the law, probably stood in Q immediately after the one just treated, and the two are carried over by the Evangelist together; both refer to the law and the prophets, but otherwise they have nothing in common. The third saying, On Divorce, is adopted in the same way. In Q it probably stood as a particular illustration of the permanence of the law asserted in the previous saying. In this way the reference to the Pharisees in xvi. 14 may be said to explain the presence of the three sayings in xvi. 16–18. This, at any rate, would appear to be the case as regards the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus in xvi. 19–31. The statement that the Pharisees were 'lovers of money' prepares the way for the parable. Confessedly artificial as the writer's method appears to be, it was a good way of combining the material at his disposal. Indeed, when we remember that Lk. xvi. is made up of two very different parables (The Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus), a few brief extracts from Q, a reference to the disciples (xvi. 1), and a second to the Pharisees (xvi. 14), it is impossible not to recognize the skill of the writer. The section closes with three further sayings from Q in xvii. 1–6 (On Offences, On Forgiveness, On Faith), to which a passage peculiar to Lk. is added, the Farmer and his Man, in xvii. 7–10. The presence of the three sayings at this point

does not seem capable of explanation on any other supposition than that the Evangelist is abstracting them from the Q document in the order in which they occurred in that source. The attempt to impose on Q a narrative form has almost broken down and he must make of his material what use he can. In the summary above, reference has been made to Dr. Moffatt's article in the *Expositor*. Following a suggestion first made by Bernhard Weiss, and partially anticipated by patristic exegesis and in Wesley's *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, Dr. Moffatt is able to trace a relationship between the Lukan Parable of the Farmer and his Man and the preceding sayings. These sayings make great demands, but the disciples are not to think that there is anything specially meritorious in their fulfilment. When we have done all, we are but 'unprofitable servants'; 'we have done that which it was our duty to do'. If, as seems probable, this is the sequence of thought in xvii. 1–10, the passage furnishes another illustration of the intimate manner in which Lukan matter and material derived from Q are woven together.

(*j*) *Lk. xvii. 11–xviii. 14.* Lk. xvii. 11 is clearly the beginning of a new section: 'And it came to pass, as they were on the way to Jerusalem, that he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.' This reference to definite localities stands in sharp contrast to the earlier sections. Evidently the plan of a journey-narrative which had almost failed from lack of definite information is now followed with a firmer hand. The material used consists of the story of the Ten Lepers (xvii. 12–19), the section drawn from Q on the Coming of the Son of Man, which is introduced by the saying about the kingdom which does not come with observation, and two Lukan parables, the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1–8) and the Pharisee and the Publican (xviii. 9–14). The story of the Ten Lepers, telling, as it does, of one leper who was a Samaritan, may account for the geographical reference in the opening verse. On the other hand, the writer may have had definite information linking the story with the last journey to Jerusalem. The Q section, the Coming of the Son of Man, probably stood at the end of that source; in any case, the writer introduces it appropriately into the story in the closing part of the journey. With this passage the Parable of the Unjust Judge,

which emphasizes the need of persevering prayer, and itself speaks of the Parousia, is brought into excellent connexion. The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican also deals with the subject of prayer, and, in its reference to 'certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and set all others at nought', reminds us of the many cases where the Pharisees stand in the background (cf. xi. 37 ff., xiii. 31, xiv. 1, xv. 1, xvi. 14, xvii. 20).

We have now passed in review the entire section, Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14. Substantially, its literary composition is the same as that of Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 and Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3. *Q is the backbone wherever it can be used as such, and into it Lukan matter is fitted. Only as the Q material comes to be exhausted is the relationship reversed.* This obtains in the latter part of the section, and even here, especially in the case of teaching regarding the Parousia, the drift of the Lukan story is determined by what the Evangelist drew from Q. Whether St. Luke was furnished with an expanded version of the Q document, or whether the expansion is the work of his own pen, Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14, the so-called 'Greater Interpolation', is Q cast into narrative form.

(*D*) *Lk. xix. 1–28.*

The fourth passage to be considered contains two sections only, the story of Zacchaeus (xix. 1–10) and the Parable of the Pounds (xix. 11–28). Whether the parable was taken by St. Luke from Q or from floating oral tradition is not certain. The difficulty arises from the resemblances and the differences between it and the Parable of the Talents in Mt. xxv. 14–30. The linguistic agreements, at any rate in Lk. xix. 16–26 and Mt. xxv. 20–9, are not inconsiderable, but there are striking divergences in the development of the story which appear to preclude immediate derivation from the same documentary source. Possibly the problem may be solved by regarding the references to the departure of the nobleman and the destruction of the rebellious citizens as Lukan expansions of the story as it appeared in Q.[1] In any case, the parable is fitted into the same

[1] Cf. the Lukan treatment of the Q story of the Healing of the Centurion's Servant (vii. 1–10, Mt. viii. 5–13) and see p. 150.

narrative-framework visible in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14. It is expressly connected with the story of Zacchaeus, and the account of the journey to Jerusalem, by the introductory words, 'And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear', and it is rounded off by the words, 'And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going up to Jerusalem'. If the parable is not directly taken from Q, we have an interesting example of the dovetailing of non-Markan matter on the same literary principles as those manifest in Sections *A*, *B*, and *C*. If Q is St. Luke's source,[1] we have a further instance of the manner in which material from this source and matter peculiar to Lk. are fused in the attempt to tell the story of the approach of Jesus and His disciples to the Holy City.

The only remaining material which may have been derived from Q is the saying in Lk. xxii. 30 b, '*And ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel*'. Streeter has recently expressed the view that Q is not the source from which the Evangelists have taken the saying.[2] If this is true, the distribution of Q matter in four (or three) definitely non-Markan sections of Lk. is remarkable. Why are Q and Mk. segregated in this manner in the Third Gospel? It has been more usual, however, to assign the passage to Q. In this case also its Lukan context is noteworthy. It occurs in the Lukan account of the conversation after the Supper, a section we have already claimed as non-Markan. Thus, not even in the case of Lk. xxii. 30 b is material from Q brought into association with matter derived from Mk.

[1] 'Is it not possible that M had a version something like this and that Matthew has conflated Q and M, following M more closely at the beginning and Q at the end? Luke, then, preserves approximately the Q form' (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 282).

[2] Cf. *The Four Gospels*, p. 288.

§ 2. *Inferences arising from St. Luke's use of Q.*

The manner in which St. Luke appears to have made use of Q may be described as follows:

(1) *In Lk. an attempt is clearly manifest to impose on Q a narrative form.* This is effected by furnishing the extracts with editorial statements, introductory and otherwise, and also by the addition of narrative and parabolic matter.

(2) *In the sections where Q is used, the Q matter usually forms the foundation of the structure.* This is the case in the first two sections, and in the greater part of the third. In the latter part of the third section, at the point where apparently the available Q material becomes more scanty, the position is to some extent reversed, and single sayings and short groups of sayings are worked into Lukan contexts at appropriate places. The fourth section is much briefer, but here again, whether Q is used or not, the same literary principles are operative, and this is also true of the saying in Lk. xxii. 30 b.

(3) A third point of the greatest importance is the fact that *in Lk. Q is always used in connexion with non-Markan matter; it is never fused with material derived from Mk.* Proof of this statement is supplied by Hawkins's detailed investigation of the so-called 'Lesser' and 'Greater' Interpolations (*O.S.S.*, pp. 29 ff.), and by Streeter's discussion of Lk. iii. 1–iv. 13 (*O.S.S.*, pp. 166 ff., 185 ff.). Our own investigation has revealed the non-Markan character of Lk. vi. 12–19 and of the Passion narrative in which Lk. xxii. 30 b occurs. It is true that the Parable of the Pounds is followed by the Markan story of the Obtaining of the Colt (Lk. xix. 29–36). But, in this case, the two sections are separated by the editorial passage by which St. Luke concludes his account of the parable: 'And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going up to Jerusalem.' The parable, moreover, is sewn on to the earlier story of Zacchaeus in its opening words: 'And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable' (xix. 11); it is merely contiguous with the Markan story of the Colt. No doubt there are cases where the word 'contiguity' rather than 'fusion' best describes the relation between non-

Markan matter and material from Q.[1] These cases, however, are relatively few. There are no cases in which Markan matter is dovetailed into material from Q, with the possible exception of the phrase 'preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins' in the account of the Preaching of John. In Lk. Mk. and Q are segregated; where combination is effected, we shall find that it is made between Mk. and Q matter which is already fused with non-Markan material, and not with Q simply, as is the case in the First Gospel.

(4) A fourth feature is *the broad similarity of plan and construction in the four main sections which have been examined.* The same kind of editorial statements occur in all, non-Markan matter and material from Q are connected in the same manner, and sections are rounded off by the same type of summary statements.[2] No more than common authorship may be suggested by these facts, but it is open to question if more than this is not required by the journey-references which run through these sections like a thread. These references are unmistakable in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 and in Lk. xix. 1–28. But they appear also in Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 (cf. iv. 1, 14 f., 16, 30), while the second section speaks of a visit to Nain and ends with the words: 'And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God . . .' (viii. 1–3).

The conclusions stated above are facts which have to be explained *on any theory* of the composition of the Third Gospel. They must be explained, for example, if Mk. is St. Luke's basal source, the foundation and framework of his Gospel. On this theory, we have to explain why Mk. and Q are segregated, and why the latter is always fused with non-Markan material, editorial, narrative, and parabolic. The difficulty is greater than has commonly been supposed. It does not seem enough, with Stanton,[3] to say that St. Luke's purpose was to interfere with the substance of his two sources as little as possible. This explana-

[1] See e. g. what is said in the summary on pp. 151 ff. regarding the story of Martha and Mary, the reference to the Galileans, and the Short Sayings in Lk. xvi. 16–18.

[2] Cf. iii. 18–20, iv. 13–14 f.; vii. 1, viii. 1–3; xi. 53 f., xiii. 22; xix. 28.

[3] Cf. *G.H.D.*, ii, p. 75.

tion does not take account of all the facts of the case, for in Lk. the Q source does not lie bare, but is supplemented with non-Markan matter, a fact which introduces a new element into the problem. The time has not yet come for us to present a reasoned statement for a better view than the accepted theory. All that we can do here is to state the inferences which would naturally account for St. Luke's manner of using Q, and there can be no doubt what these inferences are. *The facts would be satisfactorily explained by the assumption that at least three stages lie behind the Third Gospel*—(1) *the Q document, possibly to some extent already enlarged*, (2) *an expanded narrative-version of Q*, (3) *the Third Gospel, as we have it now, furnished with material derived from Mk.* The discussion of this possibility is the discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis; but before this is attempted, one task more remains. In a complicated problem it is desirable to keep apart as long as possible the separate questions which are involved. Thus, before proceeding farther, it is important to ask: What is the case for regarding the sections examined in the present chapter, together with other non-Markan passages, as the separated portions of a continuous non-Markan source? Do they possess a real unity, and how far can this be at least provisionally shown? This question will be treated in the next chapter.

VII

PROVISIONAL GROUNDS FOR AFFIRMING THE CONTINUITY OF A MAIN NON-MARKAN SOURCE

We are now in a position to consider the question: What indications does the Third Gospel contain which point to the existence of a source distinct from Mk., and treating the story of Jesus in a continuous way? In other words, Are the non-Markan sections which contain material taken from Q, together with other non-Markan sections in Lk., *the severed portions of a common source*? We first require to determine the non-Markan parts of Lk. which stand apart from everything else in the Gospel. When these have been isolated, we must consider the case for affirming the unity of the rest. We must also examine the relation of the Passion narrative to such a source, and an explanation must be given of the gap which undoubtedly exists between xxii. 14 ff. and the rest of the non-Markan material in Lk. Is the Passion narrative a separate and distinct source, or is it part of a 'special Lukan source', itself an expansion of Q?

§ 1. *Non-Markan Sections in Lk. which appear to stand apart from everything else in the Gospel.*

(1) *The Birth and Infancy Narratives of Lk. i., ii.*

The inclusion of the Birth Stories in a special Lukan source is common to the reconstructions of Feine, G. H. Müller, B. Weiss, and J. Weiss (cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 276 f.), but the objections to this view appear to be insuperable.

(1) If such a source can be posited, the case for finding the beginning of this source in the sixfold date of Lk. iii. 1–2, defining the time when John the Baptist opened his mission, is a strong one. In a continuous non-Markan source the elaborate

date of Lk. iii. 1–2 would be strange in the extreme after the simple words with which the Birth narrative begins: 'There was in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias.'

(2) A second objection is the unity and homogeneity of the Birth and Infancy Section. The arguments which have been urged against the authenticity of Lk. i., ii. have an important bearing upon the question. In his famous article on 'Mary' in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, P. W. Schmiedel stated the objections as follows:

> 'Finally, as in the case of Mt., so also in that of Lk., we must conjecture that the gospel once was without the first two chapters. Lk.'s proem (i. 1–4) speaks in favour of this presumption as also do the facts that the Baptist is in iii. 2 introduced like a person who has never yet been mentioned, and that Jesus at Nazareth (iv. 16–30) appeals in his own vindication simply to his possessing the gift of the Holy Spirit; so also the further fact that the Baptist (vii. 18 f.) allows the question to be raised whether Jesus be the Messiah or not, without knowing anything of the complete information which, according to i. 41–5, his mother possessed' (vol. iii, col. 2961).

With this statement may be compared the words of Usener in his article on 'Nativity' (*E.B.*, vol. iii, col. 3347):

> 'Whilst in Mt. the story of the childhood allows itself to be recognized as an interpolation by the fact of its being in contradiction with the rest of the gospel, in the case of Lk. we are able to confirm the results reached by criticism by referring to the testimony of the author himself. His appeal to those who 'from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word' (i. 2; cp. i. 3, *ἄνωθεν*)—even apart from the express interpretation of what he means by the expressions 'from the beginning' (*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*) and 'from the first' (*ἄνωθεν*) which he gives in Acts i. 22 (*ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος*, 'beginning from the baptism'; also x. 37, 'beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached')—would leave no room for doubt that Lk. began his gospel with the baptism and preaching of John.'

The fact that these arguments have failed to convince scholars that Lk. i., ii. is not an integral part of the Third Gospel, is not the only thing to be said about them. The facts remain when we have denied the inferences claimed by Schmiedel and Usener. These facts point to the presumption that the Birth and Infancy narratives constitute a source distinct from anything else in Lk. If there is a continuous non-Markan source, which has been used

in compiling the Third Gospel, its beginning is to be found in Lk. iii. 1–2, and we must think of this authority as a source which was reduced to writing separately from, and probably earlier than, the source utilized in Lk. i. 5–ii. 52.

(2) *The Preface to the Third Gospel* (*Lk. i. 1–4*).

No good case can be made out for the inclusion of Lk. i. 1–4 in a 'special Lukan source', and the presumption is entirely against its inclusion. The Preface contemplates the issuing or publication of a finished written work, and, if such a source as we are about to discuss existed at all, we have no good reason to think that it was intended for public circulation. Hence Lk. i. 1–4 must be regarded as an editorial preface belonging to the Third Gospel as such. It may have been the last part of the Gospel to be committed to writing.

(3) *The Non-Markan Sections in the Eschatological Discourse* (*Lk. xxi. 12–19 and 20–36, less Markan Insertions*).

The possibility of direct connexion between these sections and other non-Markan parts of Lk. was discussed on page 124 f., and was thought on the whole to be doubtful. The late date of Lk. xxi. 20–36 is not an insuperable objection, since it would be possible to regard the oracle contained in this passage as a pendant to a continuous source of earlier date. On the other hand, positive indications, pointing to the direct relationship of these sections with other non-Markan material in Lk., are lacking, and it seems best to class Lk. xxi. 12–36 (less the Markan insertions) with the Birth Stories of Lk. i., ii., and view this material as separate non-Markan matter which the Evangelist used in the compilation of his Gospel.

The only other piece of non-Markan matter which might be thought to stand apart from the rest is the story of the Call of Simon in *Lk. v. 1–11*. This narrative lacks the freshness and spontaneity of the Markan story of Mk. i. 16–20 (The Call of the First Disciples), but it is not necessary to dismiss it as a piece of late tradition. Its peculiar character is determined by the oral tradition which lies behind it, and the features which it shares with the story of Peter by the lake in the Fourth Gospel (Jn.

xxi. 1–17) point to a certain amount of confusion in the tradition. There does not seem to be any reason, however, to date the story of the Call of Simon later than the early sixties, and, in consequence, the claim to isolate this narrative from other non-Markan material in Lk. cannot be allowed. It is true that Lk. v. 1–11 stands in the Third Gospel in the midst of Markan material, but, as we shall see, there are natural connecting links between the story and the preceding and following non-Markan sections (Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 and Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3). It seems best, therefore, to include Lk. v. 1–11 with the other non-Markan sections whose claim to belong to a continuous source we are about to examine. The only non-Markan sections which appear to stand apart from the rest, and from one another, are Lk. i. 1–4, Lk. i. 5–ii. 52, and Lk. xxi. 12–36.

If we put on one side the passages mentioned above, we are left with the following non-Markan sections:

(1) Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30.
(2) Lk. v. 1–11.
(3) Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3.
(4) Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14.
(5) Lk. xix. 1–28.
(6) Lk. xix. 37–44.
(7) Lk. xix. 47–8.
(8) Lk. xxii. 14–xxiv. (less the Markan insertions).

The first, third, fourth, and fifth of these sections were examined in the last chapter in studying St. Luke's use of Q, and their general similarity of structure and arrangement became apparent. It will not be necessary to investigate these sections in detail again.[1] What we require to do is to note the connecting links between them and the other sections in the list, and then to state the case for regarding them all as the severed portions of one source. This task will be accomplished best by limiting ourselves in the first place to sections 1–7.

[1] In a sense, this is a loss, but the necessity of discussing the details of these sections in connexion with the question of St. Luke's use of Q is altogether paramount.

§ 2. *Connecting Links between the remaining Non-Markan Sections previous to the Passion and Resurrection Narrative.*

The first point to be considered is the connexion between Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30 and the story of the Call of Simon in Lk. v. 1–11. The connexion must be pronounced a good one, for after the account of the early preaching of Jesus in Lk. iv. 14–30, it is a natural transition to turn to the Call of His earliest followers. St. Luke's treatment is orderly in the sense that he takes up one theme or movement at a time. It would be much too sweeping to say that his arrangement of events is topical at the expense of chronology, but he certainly displays no penchant for the niceties of chronological exactitude in the dating of events. Thus, without any temporal statement at all, he introduces the account of the Call of Simon by the words: 'Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon him and heard the word of God, that he was standing by the lake of Gennesaret.' It should be observed that there would be quite a note of individuality in a source which introduced the Call of the first disciples at such a point. For while the Lukan story is not dated, in view of the summary statement of Lk. iv. 14–15,[1] it stands later in the succession of events than the similar story in Mk. (i. 16–20). So far as the substance of Lk. v. 1–11 is concerned, we have again, as in the case of Lk. iv. 16–30 (The Woman in the City), an example of St. Luke's power of selection. A detailed story is given in the case of one disciple (Simon), and a summary statement in the case of two others (James and John). Emphasis is laid upon the fact that 'they left all, and followed him'.

Lk. vi. 12–viii. 3 opens with the account of the Choosing of the Twelve and the reference to Many Miracles of Healing, which lead on to the Great Sermon on the Level Place (vi. 20–49). It will be seen that while the transition from Lk. v. 1–11

[1] 'And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.' In view of Jn. i. 35–51, it has been frequently suggested that the Markan story, taken by itself, leaves the impression that the first disciples were called earlier than the actual facts warrant us in supposing. It is interesting to note that, if it can be established, the Proto-Luke Theory supports this conjecture.

to Lk. vi. 12 ff. is somewhat abrupt there is continuity in respect of subject-matter; whereas the former describes the Call of Simon, the latter tells of the separation of the Twelve from a considerable number of Christ's followers. The sense of abruptness is due to the fact that in the non-Markan sections we have learnt nothing of the existence of a large body of disciples. We have read only of Simon, James, and John. It must be remembered, however, that the Markan section in Lk. v. 12–vi. 11 adds Levi only to these three, apart from the indeterminate phrase 'his disciples' in Lk. vi. 1. Even in Mk., previous to the story of the Appointment (iii. 13–19), we hear of the call of Simon, Andrew, James, John, and Levi only. The gap between Lk. v. 1–11 and Lk. vi. 12 ff. is no more than one of many similar gaps in the Synoptic record; it does not prevent us from regarding these passages as contiguous sections in the same source. The sequence of the source may be presumed to be somewhat as follows. Jesus already has a number of disciples (cf. vi. 13), among whom are Simon, James, and John (v. 1–11). Apparently, these disciples have been with Jesus for some time, but from their number no definite appointment of twelve has yet been made. St. Luke now proceeds to tell us how the appointment came to be effected. Jesus goes out into the mountain to pray, and spends a whole night in prayer to God. When dawn comes He summons His disciples and selects twelve, to whom the name 'apostles' is given. Afterwards, He descends to a level place where the rest of the disciples are assembled, together with a great crowd of people who have come to hear and to be healed of their diseases. When these have been restored, and the unclean spirits cast out from the possessed, Jesus lifts up His eyes on His disciples and begins His Great Sermon (vi. 20–49). The course of the rest of this section is traced in the discussion of St. Luke's use of Q (pp. 149 ff.). There also attention is drawn to the reference to the preaching itinerary with which the section ends (viii. 3). Accompanied by the Twelve, and by 'certain women . . . which ministered unto them of their substance', Jesus went through cities and villages, 'preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God'. It will be seen that this passage is exactly of the same kind as that which stands at the beginning of the next section, Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14: 'And it came to pass, when the

days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face.'

Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 is another of the sections treated in the last chapter, where its substance was found to consist of Q matter fused with non-Markan narratives and parables, and cast in the form of a travel-story. The following section, Lk. xix. 1–28, though much shorter, is of the same character. Having regard to the facts as described in Chapter VI, it is of much interest to compare the last portion of the former section with the opening story of the latter. Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 ends with the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, while Lk. xix. 1–28 opens with the story of Zacchaeus. It is obvious that if originally these two sections were contiguous in the same non-Markan source, the relationship between Lk. xviii. 9–14 and Lk. xix. 1–10 is of the happiest kind. Both passages tell of a publican; in the parable the publican is commended above the Pharisee; in the story Zacchaeus is described as 'a son of Abraham', and his house is chosen by Jesus for a guest-house. These facts certainly favour the view that Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 and Lk. xix. 1–28 are sundered parts of the same original. The closing words of the former section—'for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted'—prepare the way for the story of Zacchaeus as admirably as they sum up the teaching of the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

The next non-Markan section is Lk. xix. 37–44, which describes the approach of Jesus to Jerusalem and His weeping over the city.[1] The connexion of Lk. xix. 37 with the closing words of Lk. xix. 1–28 is all that could be desired. This will be seen if, for purposes of illustration, we print Lk. xix. 28, 37 as a continuous passage: 'And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going up to Jerusalem. And as he was now drawing nigh, even at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen.' Between Lk. xix. 37 and Lk. xix. 1–28 only a single Markan story (The Obtaining of the Colt, Lk. xix. 29–36) intervenes. The story of

[1] Its independence, as compared with Mk. xi. 9 ff., is discussed on p. 94 f.

Lk. xix. 37–44 tells of a paean of praise which broke from the disciples' lips as the city came in sight. In contrast to the attitude of the disciples is that of the Pharisees ('Master, rebuke thy disciples'), and in still greater contrast is the attitude of Jesus Himself, who weeps over the city and prophesies its destruction. The details of this description are particularly striking if Lk. xix. 37–44 belongs to the same source as the long journey-narrative in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14, xix. 1–28. Here, as we have seen, Jerusalem is frequently mentioned as the goal of the journey, and often the Pharisees stand in the background of the incidents described. The weeping over the city and the prophecy of its doom bring to a climax the sense of foreboding reflected in such a passage as Lk. xiii. 5: 'Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish', and still more clearly in Lk. xiii. 35: 'Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.'

Lk. xix. 47–8, which tells of the daily teaching of Jesus in the Temple, and of the hostility of the priests, now falls to be discussed.[1] After the description of Jesus weeping over the city, there is certainly an abruptness in the opening words of Lk. xix. 47: 'And he was teaching daily in the temple.' Many cases, however, have been noted, and there are others in the Acts, in which a particular narrative is followed by a summary statement (see p. 162, and cf. Acts ii. 42, v. 42, vi. 7, viii. 25, &c.). Moreover, the abruptness is not softened in the least by the Markan story of the Cleansing which separates Lk. xix. 47 from the reference to the weeping, for Lk. xix. 45 itself opens with the greatest abruptness in the words: 'And he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold.' Nowhere, indeed, in the Third Gospel is there any express reference to the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem; after the weeping on the Mount of Olives, He next appears within the city walls. The reference to the desire of the hierarchy for the destruction of Jesus is closely associated with His teaching. In this respect, it is interesting to note that in Lk. xi. 53 f. the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees who lay in wait 'to catch something out of his mouth' is also connected with the teaching of Jesus, while in the Trial scene Jesus is convicted on His own words: 'What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard

[1] The non-Markan character of this incident is discussed on p. 96 f.

from his own mouth' (Lk. xxii. 71). Thus, Lk. xix. 47–8 stands in line with other non-Markan sections. There is a further instance of agreement in the reference to the attitude of the people: 'for the people all hung upon him, listening'. The smaller part played by the people in bringing about the fate of Jesus was one of the points noticed in discussing St. Luke's Passion narrative. In the non-Markan parts of Lk. Jesus is pre-eminently the friend of the common people.

At this point, for reasons already mentioned, it is convenient to break off the discussion, and to look more closely at the case for affirming the unity of the non-Markan sections treated above.

§ 3. *The Unity of Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30; v. 1–11; vi. 12–viii. 3; ix. 51–xviii. 14; xix. 1–28; xix. 37–44; xix. 47–8.*

The question of the unity of the above-mentioned sections may be treated by considering a very pertinent objection. The similarity of these sections in form and construction points, it may be said, to no more than the fact that they are the work of the same writer; it does not follow that they are parts of the same source. This objection appears to me to be more formal than real; it fails to do justice to the full facts of the case. The reasons for this opinion may be set out as follows:

(1) The importance of the *links* between these sections has already been seen. Their presence does not prove that the sections are parts of one source, but the facts of the case are certainly contributory to that conclusion; it is of considerable importance to know that the ends of the several non-Markan sections can be brought together without strain or violence. One feels that it is more than accidental that the first section ends with the account of a Galilean mission, while the second relates the Call of Simon, and the third opens with the story of the Appointment of the Twelve. It is surely significant that the third section ends with a preaching tour, while the fourth is a long journey-narrative; that the latter ends with a parable about a publican, while the next section opens with the story of Zacchaeus; that Lk. xix. 37–44 completes the journey to Jeru-

salem, while Lk. xix. 47–8 refers to the subsequent activity of Jesus in the city. These facts have positive force if they are associated with other arguments, and this we shall find to be the case.

(2) In the second place, we may recall the tentative results reached in the last chapter. That four of the non-Markan sections are formed upon *the same ground-plan* is at once explained, if they are extracts from the same source. In Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30, vi. 12-viii. 3, ix. 51–xviii. 14, xix. 1–28 it is the Q element that is fundamental. With the single exception of Lk. xxii. 30 b, nothing else in the Third Gospel appears to have been derived from Q. Not only so, there is good reason to suppose that, beginning with the Ministry of the Baptist, these four sections reproduce with considerable accuracy the original order of Q. Q, moreover, is not simply reproduced; it is expanded, and thrown into narrative form. These facts are strange if, in Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30, vi. 12–viii. 3, ix. 51–xviii. 14, xix. 1–28, we have to do with mere fragments; on the other hand, they receive a natural explanation if the sections are severed portions of one and the same source.

(3) The fact that practically all the passages peculiar to Lk., outside the Birth and Passion narratives, occur in the four sections just discussed, points in the same direction. The exceptions are Lk. v. 1–11, xix. 37–44, and xix. 47–8, and these, as we have seen, easily and naturally fall into connexion with the four Q sections. Sufficient consideration has not been given in the past to the fact that so much material peculiar to Lk. should always be associated with Q, and not with Markan matter. The facts are not adequately explained by the answer that St. Luke desired to preserve his Markan source intact, for in any case while retaining the order of Mk., he has broken the source into several portions, some of which are separated by a considerable interval. Just as St. Luke has combined new material with Q, while retaining the order of that source, so might he have treated Mk., and that he has not done this suggests that the combination of Lukan and Q matter in the non-Markan sections was effected independently of Mk. in one and the same source.

(4) A fourth argument of a practical kind may be added. Let any one read the seven non-Markan sections from Lk. iii. 1

to Lk. xix. 48, and he will find that these passages *read as a unity*; they form a coherent narrative with a feeling-tone and a development of its own. It is true that the story lacks fullness, and, indeed, is sometimes sketchy; but this is immediately explained if the 'source' is a version of Q, converted into narrative form. The force of this argument cannot be adequately stated in words, for we are dealing with an impression left upon the mind by the phenomena of the non-Markan sections, and an impression which becomes deeper the more the facts are studied. That one is not the victim of mere subjective fancies in forming this opinion seems clear from the circumstances under which it emerges. The sense of unity left upon the mind by the non-Markan sections when read as a whole is distinct from one's opinions regarding St. Luke's use of Q, or the possibility of links between the separated sections. The latter are special problems and the evidence is comparatively concrete. When therefore the conclusions drawn in the case of these problems are supported by a distinct sense of unity, deepened by the study of the non-Markan sections, it is justifiable to add this impression to the argument. It may be that the impression is influenced by conclusions otherwise drawn; indeed, it is doubtful if the most 'scientific' investigator can keep the two entirely separate. None the less, the impression has its independent justification, and that this is so may be seen from the review of the non-Markan sections made in the present and preceding chapters. Sufficient evidence is there presented to show that the sense of unity left by the study of these sections is established by objective facts.

(5) A further argument may be mentioned here, though its full discussion is reserved for the next chapter. If we presume the unity of the non-Markan sections, and note the character of the source to which they belong, it will be found that the *deficiencies* of this source, the obvious points in which it needs to be supplemented, are precisely those which are supplied by the Markan sections. The argument may be mentioned because it reminds us that a final proof cannot be reached without considering the relation of the Markan sections to the non-Markan. If the Markan passages are correctly described as 'insertions', this carries with it the view that the non-Markan sections are parts of a continuous source. And ultimately we cannot separate these

questions; they are bound up one with the other. We have sought, so far as is possible, to isolate the separate problems, and the limits within which this can be accomplished have well-nigh been reached. Apart, however, from the question of the relation of the Markan and non-Markan elements in the Third Gospel, there are sufficient grounds for at least a provisional assertion of the unity of the passages under discussion. We have now to ask: In what relation may the Passion narrative be said to stand to this material? Is it a separate source, or is it a constituent part of the same source to which they appear to belong?

§ 4. *The Relation of the Passion and Resurrection Narrative to the Non-Markan Sections already discussed.*

The Passion narrative was fully examined in Chapter II, where it was shown to consist of a non-Markan source expanded by Markan extracts. The question now to be considered is the relation in which the original non-Markan source stands to the seven sections whose provisional unity has just been affirmed. An initial difficulty presents itself in the gap which undoubtedly exists between the Passion narrative and the rest of St. Luke's non-Markan material. There is not to be found in the Third Gospel a link which serves as a bridge to lead from one to the other. It will be remembered that the Lukan Passion narrative opens with the account of the Supper. In the Third Gospel, as we have it now, this narrative is preceded by the Markan story of the Preparations for the Passover (Lk. xxii. 7–13), and when this incident is left aside, as a later addition to the Lukan source,[1] the Passion narrative throws up a sharp edge; it begins abruptly with the words: 'And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him' (xxii. 14). The last non-Markan passage is the reference to the teaching of Jesus in Lk. xix. 47–8, or possibly, though less probably, the similar reference in Lk. xxi. 37–8. How is it possible to establish a connexion between the

[1] See p. 35.

teaching activity of Jesus in Jerusalem and the undefined 'hour' of Lk. xxii. 14?

It may be, of course, that St. Luke's Passion and Resurrection narrative rests upon a source which is separate and distinct from anything else in the Gospel. I do not myself think that this is a view which can be satisfactorily worked out, in spite of the real difficulties which the 'gap' creates. How these difficulties may be overcome may for the moment be postponed, and reserved for separate discussion. It may very well be that the Passion narrative was separately constructed; but that Q was expanded with the intention that it should be followed by the Passion narrative, in such a way as to form one continuous source, this is in every way the best view to take. Reasons for this opinion must now be given.

(1) We have seen that in any case the Passion narrative is a fragment. Its beginning is probably lost, for it is difficult to think that such a source would begin abruptly with the story of the Last Supper. Nor is it easy to think that so valuable a source would be limited to the incidents of the Passion and the Resurrection. This was our conclusion at the end of Chapter II, but in view of the investigations which have followed that chapter we can now carry the inferences farther.

(2) Antecedent probability strongly favours the theory that the Passion narrative is the sequel to the source to which the seven non-Markan sections also belong. An attempt to throw Q into a narrative form, beginning with the Ministry of the Baptist, which does not end with the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, is hardly to be thought of. We have seen that Burkitt held that Q itself contained an account of the Passion, and we may say that the arguments which fail to establish this conclusion tell with redoubled force in the case of an expanded version of Q. Such a source can never have ended with a reference to the teaching Ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem, or with the story of Jesus weeping over the doomed city.

(3) If, further, we are right in including the story of the Priests' Plot (Lk. xix. 48) in the non-Markan source, the account of what subsequently happened is the natural continuation of the source.

(4) We may, indeed, extend the last argument to the degree of

saying that the contents of the seven non-Markan sections already examined point to the fatal denouement described in the Passion narrative. As far back as Lk. ix. 51 we read of the approach of the days when Jesus should be 'received up', and, as we have repeatedly seen, the thread connecting the parts of the whole is the gradual advance upon Jerusalem. These references become more numerous as the story unfolds, until in Lk. xix. there are no less than five in non-Markan contexts (verses 1, 11, 28, 37, and 41). It may be said, indeed, that the approach and urgency of the Passion are the underlying notes of the story. From the opening of His Ministry Jesus comes as one fulfilling ancient prophecy (cf. iv. 21, 'To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears'). At the end, in the Passion narrative, He definitely applies to Himself the words, 'And he was reckoned with transgressors', declaring 'that this which is written must be fulfilled in me' (xxii. 37). We may justly say that, without the Passion narrative, the non-Markan source would be a torso. We can piece the seven non-Markan sections together, part to part, like the fragments of a broken vase, and, if we cannot so easily join on the Passion narrative with the rest, it none the less bears clear tokens that it is of the same construction and design.

§ 5. *The 'Gap' between the Passion Narrative and the earlier Non-Markan Sections.*

We have just seen that the Passion narrative and the other seven non-Markan sections are probably portions of one and the same source, and, though this is only a provisional conclusion, it encourages the hope that the 'gap' before Lk. xxii. 14 can be accounted for. We have already spoken of this difficulty, which must now be faced. Can we bridge or explain the break between the reference to the teaching of Jesus in the Temple in Lk. xix. 47 and the words by which the Lukan account of the Supper is prefaced: 'And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him' (Lk. xxii. 14)?

An explanation, in some ways attractive, though probably insufficient, may be mentioned first. Is it possible that the 'gap'

is intentional, and that 'the hour' was purposely left undefined, but pregnant with hidden meaning?

There is much to be said for the view that the non-Markan source was a work of three divisions, each of which was introduced by a temporal statement. The first, recording the work of the Baptist and the Galilean Ministry of Jesus, opens with the sixfold date of Lk. iii. 1–2. The second division, which records the ministry beyond Galilee until the eve of the Passion story, begins with the words: 'And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem' (Lk. ix. 51). The third is the Passion narrative, introduced with dramatic appropriateness in the veiled but significant words, 'And when the hour was come'. As we have seen, the way is being prepared for the hour of the Passion from Lk. ix. 51 onwards, while the necessity of the Cross is the note struck more than once in Lk. xxii.–xxiv. It behoved the Christ to suffer and to enter into His glory (Lk. xxiv. 25–7, 44–7). In this connexion we may also compare the words of Lk. xxii. 53 b, which Jesus addresses to His captors: 'But this is your hour and the power of darkness.' These words, it may be said, throw into strong relief the real hour, the hour of God, in which the victory of Saving Love is won by the suffering and shame of a cross. It may further be noted with what significance the dying cry of Jesus completes the 'hour' which opens in Lk. xxii. 14. When the 'hour' is ended, the Son commends His spirit in filial submission to the Father's keeping: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Lk. xxiii. 46). There can be no doubt that this explanation of the 'hour' does justice to certain features in the Lukan narrative; it may even express thoughts present to the Evangelist's mind. Attractive, however, as the theory is, it fails to yield full satisfaction; it does not seem likely that the reference to the hour of the Passion would have been left so bare as the theory requires us to think.

A better explanation is the frank admission that something has fallen out, or has been excised, from the non-Markan source. This theory may take two forms. It may be that, in the process of putting together the sources on which the Third Gospel depends, some phrase defining the 'hour' has been omitted from Lk. xxii. 14. This is suggested by comparison with Lk. ix. 51,

where the 'days' are defined as those when Jesus should be 'received up'. Analogy points to the possibility that originally the 'hour' of Lk. xxii. 14 was similarly explained. An alternative, and a preferable form of the same theory, is the suggestion that originally the non-Markan source contained a narrative or a statement leading up to and explaining the language of Lk. xxii. 14, and that this material has been replaced by the Markan account of the arrangements made for the celebration of the Passover.

This theory, in either of its forms, is exposed to a formidable objection. An excision-theory, so valuable if true, is by its very nature incapable of proof. The possibility and even the probability of excisions made in the non-Markan source in the process of forming the Third Gospel can readily be admitted; but to fall back upon this line of explanation frequently, or in important matters, is a precarious undertaking. I do not think that we have any alternative, however. Even if we treat the opening words of Lk. xxii. 14 as editorial, as the seam by which the Passion narrative is sewn on to the Markan story of the Preparations in Lk. xxii. 7–13, we are still confronted by the difficulty of determining what preceded the account of the Last Supper in the non-Markan source. An excision-theory, however, is quite another matter if we can show why the excision has been made; and still more if we can show that, in the nature of the case, it was inevitable. In the problem under discussion I believe we can show this necessity.

It will be remembered that, in discussing the account of the Last Supper in Chapter II, we found reason to think that in the Lukan Passion narrative the Supper was not thought of, as it is in the Third Gospel, as the actual Passover Meal. Our conclusion was that the Evangelist, influenced by St. Mark's Gospel, underwent a change of mind, the effects of which are manifest in the phenomena of Lk. xxii. 14–19a (see pp. 37 ff.). This opinion was formed apart altogether from the question now under review, but it will be seen that the two are closely connected. A natural explanation of the 'gap' at once presents itself. If our theory regarding the Lukan account of the Supper is sound, we have the strongest possible reason to suppose that Lk. xxii. 1–13 has not only been added to the Lukan Passion narrative, but has

actually replaced the original introduction to that story. In Lk. xxii. 1–13, St. Luke not only follows Mk. closely, but even emphasizes the necessity of sacrificing the Passover on the first day of Unleavened Bread (see p. 35). These points, the Evangelist's change of mind, the emphasis on the Passover, and the theory of excision, are the several aspects of one and the same literary process, and go far to support the view that originally no break existed between the seven non-Markan sections and the Passion narrative. Precisely the same argument applies if we prefer to find the excision, not in material which preceded Lk. xxii. 14, but in some phrase in that verse defining the 'hour'; but the better hypothesis is the other suggestion.

Our conclusion, then, is that, in spite of the 'gap' between the Passion narrative and the earlier non-Markan sections, the whole of this material was originally found in one continuous source. Positively, this opinion rests upon the phenomena found in the Passion narrative and the other non-Markan sections; negatively, it is supported by the evidence which explains why the break between this matter, as it now appears in the Third Gospel, was inevitable.

§ 6. *Summary.*

We may summarize the discussion of the present chapter by saying that we have found good reason for the provisional acceptance of the theory that a continuous non-Markan source has been used in the composition of the Third Gospel, and that this source is to be found in Lk. iii. 1–iv. 30, v. 1–11, vi. 12–viii. 3, ix. 51–xviii. 14, xix. 1–28, xix. 37–44, xix. 47–8, and xxii. 14–xxiv (less the Markan additions). It is part of the difficulty of our problem that we cannot view all the several elements of the question at a glance; we have to take them one by one. The significance of these elements, however, is cumulative; our conclusion is the goal of many separate lines of approach. These features include the links between the non-Markan sections, the disposition of Q matter and of material peculiar to Lk. within these sections, the continuity of the subject-matter, the cross-references and connecting links between the Passion narrative and the rest, the explanation which bridges the break at the begin-

ning of the Lukan story of the Last Supper. On such evidence, it is reasonable to view the above-mentioned sections as the sundered portions of a single source. Doubtless this conclusion can be no more than provisionally accepted until we treat more closely the relation in which the Markan sections stand in respect of this material. No fuller conclusion than this, however, is necessary to enable us to approach the discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, while a conclusion subject even to the limitations mentioned considerably simplifies the investigation.

VIII

THE PROTO-LUKE HYPOTHESIS

THE Proto-Luke Hypothesis, as already indicated, posits a continuous non-Markan source, consisting mainly of Q matter and material peculiar to Lk., as the foundation and framework of the Third Gospel. This document represents the first stage in the composition of Lk., although, at the time when it was constructed, no thought of the larger work was in the writer's mind. At that time, his purpose was to give to the source commonly known as Q a narrative form, by adding to it stories and parables which by his own research he had gathered, and in particular an account of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. Immediate publication may not have been the object in view, but subsequently this document was used in the construction of a larger work, the Third Gospel, which, though addressed to an individual, was certainly intended for wider circulation. Proto-Luke, for so we may call this document, was the main source used in compiling the Gospel. Into it large extracts from Mk. have been inserted, and the whole has been preceded by the Birth and Infancy narratives and the Preface to the Gospel (i. 1–4). Such, then, is Proto-Luke, and to its description we may add the claim that it consists of the continuous non-Markan source, whose unity was discussed and provisionally affirmed in the last chapter.

This theory, of course, completely reverses the commonly accepted account of the Third Gospel, according to which the framework has been supplied by Mk., into which the Evangelist has inserted matter from Q and his special material at two points in the Markan outline—the so-called 'Lesser' and 'Greater Interpolations', Lk. vi. 20–viii. 3 and Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14. It is not to be denied that the accepted theory explains many facts within the Third Gospel, but the question is whether it explains all the facts, and whether indeed the facts which it does explain are not better

accounted for by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. The latter is our contention, and in the present chapter reasons must be given for this opinion.

§ 1. *The Case for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.*

The following are the questions to be considered:

(1) The analogy presented by the phenomena of the Passion and Resurrection narrative.

(2) The manner in which Mk. is actually used.

(3) St. Luke's use of Q.

(4) The relation of the Markan sections to the (presumed) continuous non-Markan source.

(5) The 'Markan Omissions' in their bearing on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

(6) Phenomena within the Third Gospel which are explained by the Proto-Luke Theory.

(*a*) The opening verses of Lk. iii.
(*b*) The position of the Lukan Genealogy.
(*c*) The order in which Mk. is reproduced.
(*d*) The position given to the Sermon at Nazareth.
(*e*) The 'Greater Interpolation'.
(*f*) The position assigned to the story of the Cure of the Blind Man at Jericho.
(*g*) The implications of St. Luke's Preface.

(7) The agreement of the theory with all that we know of the Evangelist's literary methods, and in particular with his use of the 'We-Sections' in the Acts.

(1) *The Analogy presented by the Phenomena of the Passion and Resurrection Narrative.*

In Chapter V (p. 134 f.) it was urged that a serious difficulty is raised by the Lukan Passion narrative, if Mk. is the Evangelist's primary source in the composition of the Third Gospel, inasmuch as in both Gospels the Passion is the climax of the whole story. While St. Matthew makes more and more use of Mk. as the narrative proceeds, St. Luke, on the contrary, practically abandons the Markan source from the story of the Supper onwards,

inserting a few extracts only from this Gospel into his independent account. If St. Luke uses Mk. as his principal authority, why does he abandon that source at its final and most important point?

(2) *The Manner in which Mk. is actually used.*

This question is discussed in detail in Chapter V (pp. 126 ff.), but the conclusions which are reached there must be related to our present discussion. That Markan and non-Markan matter are distributed in alternate stripes was one of the points to which Streeter drew attention in his *Hibbert* article.[1] Our own investigation not only revealed some eight considerable belts of Markan material, but also showed that each belt, with a doubtful exception,[2] has a characteristic note or colour. Two of them describe the incidents of important days in the Ministry of Jesus, while others contain miracle-stories or parabolic teaching, narratives connected with Galilee or with the last journey to Jerusalem. There is no need to go over all this ground again, except to recall the conclusion which was drawn. To a considerable extent the problem could be isolated, and it seemed fair to conclude that, in using this material, St. Luke was an excavator or treasure-seeker. To him Mk. was a quarry, not a foundation. It is clear that to the degree that we recognize this, we give support to the Proto-Luke Theory. For this theory fully allows for such a use of Mk. as the facts seem to presuppose. It is part of the theory that Proto-Luke was a document certain to be supplemented, and the manner in which Mk. has been employed in Lk. is precisely that which any one would adopt with such an object in view. This argument will be carried much farther when we come to discuss the disposition of Markan matter in relation to the presumed non-Markan source.

(3) *St. Luke's Use of Q.*

St. Luke's use of Q is another problem capable of being isolated and treated apart from the direct discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. This was attempted in Chapter VI, where it

[1] *H.J.*, vol. xx, no. 1, p. 106; *The Four Gospels*, p. 208.
[2] Lk. ix. 18–50. See p. 91.

was seen that in the Third Gospel Q is used as the foundation of the narrative sections in which it appears. Fused with non-Markan matter and furnished with editorial passages, which include frequent references to the journeys of Jesus, Q stands apart from the Markan sections of the Gospel. Our conclusion was that the facts would be satisfactorily explained if at least three stages could be presumed to lie behind the Third Gospel: (1) the Q document, possibly to some extent enlarged; (2) an expanded narrative version of Q; (3) the Third Gospel, as we have it now, furnished with Markan matter. The significance of this conclusion is its association with the other arguments we are presenting. We need claim no more than the results of Chapter VI, except to urge that St. Luke's use of Q is entirely congruous with the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, and is naturally explained by it. Following upon the similar opinion reached with respect to St. Luke's use of Mk., this claim undoubtedly carries us a step farther.

(4) *The Probability of the Existence of a continuous Non-Markan Source, and the Relation of the Markan Sections thereto.*

The arguments which have been stated thus far are mere summaries of questions which have been treated earlier. The present argument breaks new ground; it concerns the relation in which the Markan sections in Lk. stand to the 'non-Markan source' as provisionally determined in Chapter VII. In spite of the arguments used in that chapter, we may still regard this 'source' as a 'hypothetical document'. As such we are entitled to discuss any relationships which it may be presumed to have towards other matter used in the Third Gospel. The trend of our earlier arguments in favour of conceding its existence will receive confirmation if we can show that the Markan elements in Lk. stand in a secondary relationship to it.

We will consider first the characteristics of this hypothetical source. It consists of an expanded version of Q, to which a Passion narrative has been added. Beginning with the Ministry of John and the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus, its account of the Galilean Ministry is obviously slight and sketchy.

Only 119 out of its 702 verses, or about one-sixth, can be assigned with any confidence to this period. For although xvii. 11 refers to Galilee, and although it is natural to suppose that sayings and parables placed later than ix. 51 may belong to the Galilean Ministry, only the passages iv. 14–30 and vi. 12–viii. 3 constitute Galilean sections in the 'non-Markan source'. Admittedly, this is a deficiency in that source, due to lack of information, and we may well suppose that, with further tradition at his disposal, it is a deficiency which the writer would wish to supply. A second instance, pointing to lack of information, appears at the close of the journey to Jerusalem. The writer knows no more than that the disciples exulted, while Jesus wept, as the city came into view, and that after entering Jerusalem, Jesus was found teaching daily in the Temple, to the annoyance of the hierarchy and the delight of the people. A further deficiency of the 'non-Markan source' is its lack of parables relating to the Kingdom of God. In parabolic matter this source is singularly rich, but the parables are 'parables of human life'; those of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, both derived from Q, are the only parables of the Kingdom.

It is significant that *these deficiencies in the non-Markan sections are precisely the characteristic features of the Markan sections*. It is from Mk. that the Third Evangelist has obtained the greater part of his information regarding the Ministry of Jesus, both in Galilee and in Jerusalem. It is from Mk. also that he has drawn the Parable of the Sower, just as later he has taken from Mk. the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and the Parable of the Ripening Fig Tree. It can hardly be said that the miracle-narratives of the Markan sections supply deficiencies in the non-Markan sections, for considering the comparatively small narrative element, outside the story of the Passion, these sections are rich in miracle-stories. None the less, it is fair to say that the author of the 'non-Markan source' was a writer likely to welcome wonder-narratives. As we have seen, the Markan additions to the Passion narrative include the references to the Darkness and the Rending of the Veil of the Temple, both of which were probably regarded by the Evangelist as miraculous. He has also accepted a detail from St. Mark's account of the high priest's servant, in such a way that a story of healing has

probably been transformed into the story of the restoration of a severed ear (cf. p. 46). If, then, as we shall argue later, St. Luke himself is the author of the 'non-Markan source', such passages as i. 40–iii. 6, iv. 35–v. 43, and vi. 30–44 would be especially welcome to him, inasmuch as they are not only Galilean sections but blocks of miracle-narrative matter. Even if the writer is not the Evangelist himself, the same inference holds good, in view of the many miracles narrated in the non-Markan sections, which amongst others include the Healing of the Dropsical Man, the Cure of the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity, and the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain.

It may be urged that the present argument is capable of being reversed, and that the non-Markan sections supply what is lacking in Mk. There is force in this argument so long as we limit ourselves to the Q element in the non-Markan sections. If we do this, then we can say that what the Third Evangelist has taken from his Markan source has been interpolated with selections from Q. But this is not a true view of the situation; the non-Markan sections are not simply Q, but Q already expanded and interlaced with matter peculiar to Lk., and if we discuss their relation to the Markan element in Lk., we must treat them as such. Can we, then, distinguish and describe these sections and show, for example, how vi. 12–viii. 3, ix. 51–xviii. 14, and xix. 1–28 differ one from another and supply the needs of a writer who seeks to produce an enlarged edition of Mk.? With what justice do we speak of the 'Lesser' and the 'Greater interpolation'? Why should the long, but loosely constructed passage, ix. 51–xviii. 14, strung as it is upon the slender thread of a journey-narrative, be allowed to remain intact, unless it already existed as part of an earlier source? Why does this section of nearly nine chapters separate the Markan story of Peter's Confession (with the account of the Transfiguration and that of the Second Prediction of the Passion) from the natural sequel to these events, which is a rapid survey of the incidents leading up to the Passion story itself? We have, it is true, a brief reference to a journey in Mk. x. 1, but to suggest that it is this passage which led the Third Evangelist to insert some 350 non-Markan verses at this point in the Markan outline is to pay lip-service to the theory that Mk. is his foundation-document.

So far from supplying the deficiencies of the Markan source, the so-called 'Greater Interpolation' throws that source into confusion, if it must be presumed to be the basis of Lk. In short, it does not seem possible seriously to contemplate the non-Markan sections, when viewed in their entirety, as additions to what is taken from the Markan source. A case can be stated only if we look resolutely at the Q element in these sections, and ignore their character as fusions of Q and of non-Markan matter. The case for regarding the Markan sections as 'extracts' and as 'insertions' into a non-Markan document is immeasurably superior. On this view, we not only explain St. Luke's use of Mk. and of Q, we also give the clearest and most satisfactory explanation of the way in which Markan and non-Markan passages are related in the Third Gospel. If we accept this conclusion, we can remove the inverted commas from the phrase the 'non-Markan source', and accept this authority as St. Luke's primary document, the foundation and framework of his Gospel.

(5) *The 'Markan Omissions' in their bearing on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.*

The question of the 'Markan Omissions' was discussed in the second part of Chapter V, where it was found that no satisfactory explanation of these omissions is forthcoming so long as our attention is limited to St. Mark's Gospel. We must now take up this question again at the point which has been reached, for it is of the greatest importance in relation to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Writing about the 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26), Dr. Moffatt has claimed that it is 'of extreme importance for the general relation between Luke and Mark' (*I.N.T.*, p. 627). The same remark may be extended to all the 'Markan Omissions'.

We have seen that, corresponding to most of the 'Markan Omissions', there are Lukan parallel passages derived from other sources, and in our earlier discussion it was recognized that so long as these passages are isolated, and each is considered alone, it is still possible, even if it is difficult, to look upon Mk. as St. Luke's principal source (see pp. 141 ff.). When, however, these

Lukan narratives and sayings are found to be anything but isolated passages, but rather integral parts of a continuous non-Markan source, beginning with the Baptist and ending with the Resurrection, the situation is very different indeed. In this case, we can only conclude that the Markan passages are omitted because the Evangelist looks upon the non-Markan source as his primary authority. Proto-Luke is preferred, and the 'Markan Omissions' stamp the Second Gospel as a supplementary source!

The presumption of this argument is, of course, the existence of the non-Markan source. It can reasonably be claimed that the probability of its existence, argued in Chapter VII, is considerably strengthened by arguments advanced in the last section. Thus might we justify its use as a presupposition in discussing the 'Markan Omissions'. Inasmuch, however, as the consequences of admitting the existence of this source are so sweeping, and recognizing that its final vindication is the Proto-Luke Hypothesis itself, I prefer to state the case in another way. The present argument, therefore, is no more than the contention that, on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, the 'Markan Omissions' receive their most natural and adequate explanation. If this can be shown, it will be an additional reason from an entirely different quarter in favour of the Proto-Luke Theory, since confidence in the truth of a hypothesis grows in proportion to the difficulties which it solves. The argument may be stated as follows:

(*a*) The Proto-Luke Hypothesis supplies the fullest explanation of the 'Great Omission' (Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26).

(*b*) It explains why the Q version has been preferred by St. Luke in cases where Mk. and Q overlap.

(*c*) It also accounts for the omission of the remaining Markan narratives enumerated on page 141.

(A) On the Proto-Luke Theory, we can explain St. Luke's omission of Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 by saying that the section was not required by him, and indeed was unsuitable for his purpose. According to this theory, St. Luke's idea in using Mk. was to expand his earlier non-Markan source. In particular, he was on the look-out for Galilean material in consequence of the

somewhat meagre treatment given to this period in Proto-Luke. For this purpose such Markan extracts as i. 21–iii. 6, iii. 31–iv. 25, iv. 35–v. 43, vi. 7–16, vi. 30–44, viii. 27–ix. 40 were much more suitable than vi. 45–viii. 26. A considerable portion of the latter is not Galilean matter at all, but belongs to the journey into the regions of Tyre and Sidon, back again to the Sea of Galilee, and then into Decapolis. When, further, we add the various objections which St. Luke is supposed to have felt regarding many of the individual narratives within this section, we can see that, if he was seeking Markan extracts by which to expand Proto-Luke, Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 would be just the section which would *not* be selected. Thus, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis furnishes an explanation why the section is omitted *en bloc*. On the view that Mk. is St. Luke's principal source, the only satisfactory suggestion which deals with the passage as a whole is the view that Mk. vi. 45–viii. 26 is a later insertion in the Second Gospel. As, on linguistic grounds, this view cannot be sustained, the solution supplied by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is the most adequate of all; it combines the merits of theories which treat parts of the 'Great Omission' individually with the added virtue of explaining the neglect of the passage as a whole.

(B) On the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, many Markan passages were omitted because they already stood in St. Luke's expanded version of Q. This is much the best view to take; it is very unsatisfactory to suppose that these passages were first excluded in their Markan form, and then brought together in their Q form by the Evangelist in the non-Markan sections in which they occur. Has St. Luke, for example, rejected the Markan Beelzebub section (Mk. iii. 22–7) with the intention of giving the fuller Q version of this passage in a completely different context (Lk. xi. 14–23)? Is it for the same reason that he has passed by the Markan saying on the Sin of Blasphemy (Mk. iii. 28–30), which in Mk. immediately follows the Beelzebub section, but in Lk. occurs later (xii. 10)? Has St. Luke ignored the Markan section, ix. 41–x. 12, because he wanted to distribute three Q passages covering the same ground in new and separate contexts—the teaching on Offences in Lk. xvii. 1–2 (cf. Mk. ix. 42–8), the sayings about Salt in Lk. xiv. 34–5 (cf. Mk. ix. 49–50), and the statement about Divorce and Adultery in Lk. xvi.

18 (cf. Mk. x. 1–12)? Does he omit Mk. xii. 28–34 (The Two Great Commandments) because the Q version of this incident (cf. Lk. x. 25–8) will form a better introduction to the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. x. 29–37)? So might we continue; and even if in some cases we answer these questions in the affirmative, that is not enough. All must be answered thus, if Mk. is St. Luke's primary source; the Evangelist must be credited with an editorial freedom of the most far-reaching kind, and we must have recourse to the most ingenious speculations to account for his literary procedure. How much simpler is the one consistent explanation which in all these cases we can give on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis! The Markan passages are not used because the parallel Q sayings have already found their place in Proto-Luke. The Evangelist's preference is not so much between the Markan and the Q version of this or that saying; it is a preference between sources, it is a choice between a non-Markan source in which the Q passages already occur and the Second Gospel, which is his supplementary source and not his primary authority.[1]

(C) As regards the remaining 'Markan Omissions', which are chiefly narratives (see the list on p. 141), the explanation supplied by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is the same as that offered in Section B. The Markan passages are neglected in deference to parallel or similar passages in Proto-Luke. This will be seen if we discuss such test cases as the omission of the Call of the First Disciples (Mk. i. 16–20), the Visit to Nazareth (Mk. vi. 1–6), the Request of James and John (Mk. x. 35–45), and the Anointing at Bethany (Mk. xiv. 3–9).

A comparison of each of these narratives with the corresponding Lukan passage reveals a difference of order as well as of source. In three cases, moreover, the Lukan passage is organically related to other non-Markan matter. *The Synagogue Incident at Nazareth* (Lk. iv. 16–30) is the climax of a series of non-Markan narratives beginning with the Ministry of John (iii. 1–20), and following on with the Baptism of Jesus (iii. 21–2), the Genealogy (iii. 23–38), the Temptation (iv. 1–13), and the Departure to Galilee (iv. 14–15). The story of *The Woman in*

[1] Cf. Streeter, *H.J.*, vol. xx, no. 1, p. 107; *The Four Gospels*, p. 209 f.

the City (Lk. vii. 36–50) is sewn on to the preceding non-Markan passage about the Son of man as the friend of publicans and sinners (Lk. vii. 34). Whether this is in the Evangelist's mind a parallel to the Markan story of the Anointing at Bethany or not, at any rate it explains his neglect of that story. The Lukan passage about *True Greatness* (xxii. 25–7), which in Mk. is part of the story of the Request of James and John, belongs to the account of Christ's words to His disciples after the Last Supper. In the remaining instance, *The Call of Simon* (Lk. v. 1–11), the narrative as it appears in the Third Gospel stands isolated from other non-Markan matter, but reasons have been given elsewhere (p. 166 f.) for thinking that originally this incident also had a definitely chosen position in the non-Markan source. These facts strongly suggest that the omission of the Markan stories and the use of the non-Markan is the result of a choice between independent sources. As before, the alternative explanation is to suppose that St. Luke omits the Markan narrative because elsewhere, in a totally different connexion, he intends to use another version, in some cases actually of the same story, and in others of one which is very similar—a use of Mk. which pays it doubtful homage as a primary source! One and the same answer meets every case. On the Proto-Luke Hypothesis St. Luke does not need these Markan passages, since in Proto-Luke he has narratives either parallel to them or corresponding to them. Already in Proto-Luke he has recorded the story of the Call of Simon; thus his eye rests on Mk. i. 16–20 (The Call of the First Disciples) only to pass it by. His non-Markan source introduces his account of the Galilean Ministry with the sublime story of the Sermon at Nazareth; what need has he for Mk. vi. 1–6? His Passion narrative already contains Christ's teaching about Greatness; why then utilize Mk. x. 42–5, and Mk. x. 35–41 (the story of James and John) by which it is introduced? As regards the Markan story of the Anointing at Bethany, a twofold reason for its omission suggests itself on the Proto-Luke Theory. On the one hand, Proto-Luke already contained the similar story of the Woman in the City. On the other hand, the Markan block in xiv. 1–16 (cf. Lk. xxii. 1–13) is taken over to form an introduction to the Lukan Passion narrative. From it St. Luke selects

just what he requires—the statement about the Approach of the Passover and the Fear of the Priests (Mk. xiv. 1–2), the account of the Treachery of Judas (Mk. xiv. 10–11), and the story of the Preparations for the Passover (Mk. xiv. 12–16). Obviously for his purpose the story of the Anointing at Bethany (Mk. xiv. 3–9) is an excrescence; the Evangelist does not need it; he quarries only the Markan stones which are required to build the threshold to his Passion narrative. This particular argument will stand only if our later contention that the Evangelist is the author of Proto-Luke is sustained, but in any case the presence of Lk. vii. 36–50, as an organic element in Proto-Luke, accounts for the omission of Mk. xiv. 3–9. Along precisely the same lines, on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, we can explain the neglect of the remaining narratives in the list of 'Markan Omissions' printed on page 141. So far as the Lukan story of the Exultant Approach to Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 37–40) is concerned, we have already claimed in our earlier discussion (see p. 142 f.) that Mk. is treated as a secondary authority.

Reviewing the three classes into which we have divided the 'Markan Omissions', we find that in each case it is the Proto-Luke Hypothesis which supplies the key to the problem. We need have no hesitation in claiming this fact as a further reason for believing in the truth of that hypothesis.

(6) *Phenomena within the Third Gospel which are explained on the Proto-Luke Theory.*

Just as the Proto-Luke Hypothesis enables us to explain the 'Markan Omissions', so also it accounts for many other striking features present within the Third Gospel. Some of these have already been treated and will therefore only be mentioned here, but others will call for fuller notice.

(a) *The Opening Verses of Lk. iii.*

Reference was made to this passage in Chapter VII in connexion with the view that the Birth and Infancy section stands apart from everything else in the Third Gospel. On the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, Lk. iii. 1–2 is the beginning of Proto-Luke,

and when so regarded its peculiarities are at once explained. This will be seen more clearly if we print the passage in full:

> 'Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.'

As the introduction to Proto-Luke, this somewhat elaborate date is naturally accounted for, and the fact that the Baptist is referred to as if he were being mentioned in the Third Gospel for the first time raises no difficulty. We can say neither of these things on the ordinary theory of the composition of the Gospel, and especially is this the case if, with Harnack, Hawkins, Ramsay, and others, we decline to explain Lk. i. 5–ii. 52 as a later interpolation in the Gospel. In rightly declining to accept the interpolation-theories of Schmiedel and Usener, New Testament scholars have tended to slur over the difficulties raised by Lk. iii. 1–2, the true reading in Lk. iii. 22 ('To-day have I begotten thee'), the position of the Genealogy in Lk. iii. 23–38, and the surmise of the people in the synagogue at Nazareth, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' (Lk. iv. 22). Everything falls into line if Lk. iii. 1–2 was the beginning of an early non-Markan source.

(b) *The Position of the Lukan Genealogy.*

The argument used in the case of Lk. iii. 1–2 applies equally well as regards the 'curious position' of the Lukan Genealogy (iii. 22–38).[1] In Mt. the Genealogy appears at the very beginning of the Gospel, and in like manner, if the existence of Proto-Luke is allowed, it occurs immediately after the first reference to Jesus in that document (iii. 21–2). In the Third Gospel, as we have it now, the Genealogy is separated from the Birth and Infancy section, and it contains the lame phrase 'as was supposed' in its most vital link. The later insertion of this phrase by the Evangelist himself, and the position of the Genealogy in the Gospel, are easily explained if the Proto-Luke Theory is true.

[1] Cf. Streeter, *H.J.*, vol. xx, 1, p. 106; *The Four Gospels*, p. 209.

It may be said, indeed, that this theory supplies a valuable key to the whole problem of the Virgin Birth in the Third Gospel on its critical side.

(c) *The Order in which Mk. is reproduced.*

The Proto-Luke Theory also accounts for the fidelity with which the order of Mk. is reproduced in the Third Gospel. It does this, not by supposing that to St. Luke the order of Mk. was sacrosanct, but by the view that what the Evangelist sought from Mk. in the process of expanding Proto-Luke were 'extracts' homogeneous in character and subject-matter. The one instance[1] in which, on this theory, St. Mark's order is altered (The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus, Mk. iii. 31–5) confirms this view. For, in utilizing Mk. iii. 31–iv. 25, the Evangelist is clearly attracted by the parabolic element of which the section so largely consists. Accordingly, in Lk. viii. 4–21 this material stands first, and the story of the Visit is transferred to the end.

(d) *The Position given to the Sermon at Nazareth.*

The excellent place assigned to this narrative, on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, and the reason for the neglect of the parallel account of Mk. vi. 1–6 are discussed on pages 142 and 148.

(e) *The 'Greater Interpolation'.*

This question also, which is discussed in detail on pages 151–9, is mentioned here for the purpose of bringing all the elements of the problem together. As an integral part of Proto-Luke, Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14 is much more naturally accounted for than by the view that it is a section interpolated into the Markan framework. On the latter view, as we have seen, the narratives of Mk. viii. 27–ix. 32 (= Lk. ix. 18–45), which anticipate the Passion, are cut off from their natural sequel by many long chapters. No doubt the same fact obtains on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, but its significance is entirely different if, as this theory suggests, the Markan source is not the Evangelist's framework.

[1] Other apparent instances (Mk. iii. 7–12, 13–19) are cases in which a non-Markan version is preferred (see pp. 81–3), or, as in the Passion narrative, cases in which a Markan passage is inserted in a non-Markan context (see pp. 36–67).

(f) *The Position assigned to the story of the Cure of the Blind Man at Jericho* (Lk. xviii. 35–43 = Mk. x. 46–52).

St. Mark, followed by the First Evangelist, connects this incident with the departure of Jesus from Jericho, whereas St. Luke, although Mk. is his source, says that it took place as Jesus 'drew nigh unto Jericho'. This difference was referred to on page 93 f. in connexion with the question of St. Luke's debt to Mk., and it now invites further consideration. The divergence from Mk. is not satisfactorily explained by the suggestion of inadvertence, and still less by supposing the incidents to be separate cures; it is due to a conscious alteration of Mk. On the Proto-Luke Theory, we can see why the change was made. In Proto-Luke the Zacchaeus incident occurs as Jesus is passing through Jericho (Lk. xix. 1), and from this point the story moves on rapidly in the direction of Jerusalem. It is in connexion with the journey-period previous to the arrival at Jericho that St. Luke wished to expand his original document, and it is for this reason that he has taken over the Markan section, x. 13–xi. 8, which contains the story of the Blind Man. From this section he has omitted the story of James and John (x. 35–45), and he has transferred the story of the Obtaining of the Colt (xi. 1–8) to the only context in which it could be used, that is, as an introduction to the story of the Exultant Approach of the Disciples to Jerusalem. In view of the existing structure of Proto-Luke, the rest of the Markan section (x. 13–52) had to be inserted, if at all, before the arrival at Jericho as a group of journey-stories. Hence it is that in the Third Gospel the Cure of the Blind Man, contrary to what we find in Mk. and Mt., precedes the entry into that town. It would be a rash inference to conclude that purely literary considerations have led to an arbitrary treatment of Mk. Influenced by his Proto-Luke document, the Evangelist may have formed the opinion that his placing of the Cure was historically correct. He was not merely manipulating Mk. to suit a literary convenience, but correcting Mk. by inferences suggested by his non-Markan source. This theory is preferable to the suggestion that the variation is simply a matter of inadvertence, but even on the latter view it is easier to account

for the oversight if we presuppose the existence of Proto-Luke.[1]

(g) *The Implications of St. Luke's Preface.*

> 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed' (Lk. i. 1–4).

These words are recognized on all hands as of the utmost importance in connexion with theories of the composition of the Gospel.[2] In them the Evangelist refers to the labours of his predecessors who had essayed to record the common Christian tradition. There is no disparagement, either expressed or latent, in St. Luke's reference to these writers; indeed, in the words 'it seemed good to me also' he rather classes himself with them. At the same time the fact that he proposes to draw up a narrative of his own implies that he regarded their work as incomplete, and that he felt himself qualified, in view of the information at his disposal, to improve on their efforts. It is true that, like these earlier writers, the Evangelist himself is dependent upon the tradition handed down by 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word'; he is not of those who actually saw and heard the Lord. Nevertheless, his claim to have traced the course of all things accurately from the first is a modest but unmistakable claim to

[1] In default of an explanation of the divergence between the Synoptists, it is frequently thought enough to say that such differences prove the independence of the Evangelists in matters of detail without affecting their historical trustworthiness. Cf. *D.C.G.*, i. 173. True as this is, the uncritical spirit of the harmonists, ancient and modern, is to be preferred, for they at least do see that in the divergences there is a problem to be solved.

[2] Cf. Plummer, *I.C.C., St. Lk.*, p. 2: 'This prologue contains all that we really *know* respecting the composition of early narratives of the life of Christ, and it is the test by which theories as to the origin of our Gospels must be judged. No hypothesis is likely to be right which does not harmonize with what is told us here.' Cf. also Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 489: '[The Preface] is the only place in the synoptic gospels where the consciousness of authorship is expressed, containing as it does the only reference outside the gospel of John to the origin or purpose of the evangelic record.'

stand nearer to this autoptic testimony than 'the many', and thus to be able to improve on the task which they had attempted. Among these earlier attempts to narrate the primitive tradition we must include St. Mark's Gospel, and it is not impossible to regard St. Luke's task as that of supplying the deficiencies of this earlier work, by adding to it sayings from Q and narratives and parables of which he had independent knowledge. But this, the accepted theory of the composition of Lk., is to ascribe to the Third Evangelist little more than the functions of an editor, whereas the Preface expresses 'the consciousness of authorship'.[1] Was St. Luke dissatisfied with the work of his predecessors only to give an enlarged and improved version of one of their works? After such a Preface as Lk. i. 1–4 it is reasonable to expect an independent attempt to tell the Gospel story, based on close, if not immediate, contact with what is told. It is no small merit of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis that it permits us to do justice to this expectation. On this theory, the work of the Evangelist is in complete harmony with the implications of his Preface. For to expand a copy of Q, giving it narrative form by adding to it stories, parables, and sayings, and above all a detailed Passion and Resurrection narrative; then, later, to enlarge this early document by means of copious extracts from Mk., by an oracle relating to the siege, and by stories of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus, is a procedure which can well have been adopted by an author who claims to write in order, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, and whose purpose it is to give certainty in the things in which Christians have been instructed.

(7) *The Agreement of the Theory with all that we know of the Evangelist's Methods, and in particular with his use of the 'We-Sections' in Acts.*

We know nothing of the Evangelist's methods beyond what we can learn from the Gospel itself and the Acts.[2] These works,

[1] Cf. Cadbury in the note on p. 197.

[2] The common authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts is rarely disputed. It is affirmed among others by Plummer, *I.C.C.*, *St. Lk.*, p. xi f., Hawkins, *H.S.*[2], pp. 174 ff., Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 297, and H. Windisch, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 306. Moffatt says that the negative view 'should nowadays be decently interred under the epitaph, "non fui, fui, non sum"' (*op. cit.*, p. 298).

however, do reveal to critical research some of the secrets of their author's craftsmanship, and it is reassuring to find that his methods are in complete accord with what is implied in the Proto-Luke Hypothesis itself. This claim, for which justification must be given, is not advanced as a positive argument comparable to some of those stated above. It is adduced because it is one of the principles of our investigation to be able to give a credible account of the Evangelist's use of the sources which are disclosed by critical inquiry. This will be achieved if, in addition to urging the self-consistency of the Proto-Luke Theory, we can show that this hypothesis is congruous with what we can learn of the writer's methods in the Acts.

In an excursus in his book, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Harnack has instanced one point in which the plan of the Gospel and of the Acts are alike, in spite of the difference between the two works: 'In his gospel St. Luke has arranged his material under headings: Jesus in Galilee; Jesus on His way from Galilee through Samaria, &c., to Jerusalem; Jesus in Jerusalem. In the Acts the plan is analogous: the Gospel in Jerusalem; the Gospel on its way from Jerusalem through Samaria, &c., into the Gentile World and to Rome; the Gospel in Rome. In both cases the *progression* within the "καθεξῆς" is the chief consideration, and forms the thread of the narrative' (p. 275). It is significant that if we alter the third word in this quotation, and read 'Proto-Luke' instead of 'gospel', the statement will still stand. Indeed, the parallel is even closer, since, more than the Gospel itself, Proto-Luke is a work in which 'the progression within the "καθεξῆς" is the chief consideration, and forms the thread of the narrative'.

Another point which invites attention is the comparison between Proto-Luke and the 'We-Sections' in the Acts. The treatment of this comparison, however, is dependent upon the view that the Evangelist himself is the author of Proto-Luke—a matter we have yet to discuss; it rests also upon the thesis that he is the diarist of Acts—a view which, in spite of the strong advocacy of Hawkins and Harnack, has recently been called into question by H. Windisch[1] and the Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*.[2] It would throw our immediate

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 298 ff. [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 160, 169, 359.

investigation entirely out of proportion to treat the question of the authorship of the 'We-Sections' at this point. All that need be said here is that, if both the assumptions mentioned above are valid, the character of the 'We-Sections' renders the existence of such a document as Proto-Luke thoroughly credible, if it is otherwise supported by positive arguments. Different as in many respects they are, Proto-Luke and the diary have much in common. Both are travel-documents, and both are rich in miracle-stories. Each contains a story of raising from the dead[1] and a farewell address.[2] Each has a city as its goal; in Proto-Luke Jerusalem, and in the 'We-Sections' the Imperial city of Rome. If the two documents are the work of the same writer, the diary being the earlier, we have a natural explanation of the form into which Proto-Luke was thrown; it was the work of a traveller whose personal experiences have conditioned his literary methods.

The force of the argument sketched in the last paragraph obviously depends on the truth of the assumptions on which it rests. Apart, however, from these assumptions, the use made of the 'We-Sections' in the Acts supplies a parallel to the use which has been made of Proto-Luke in the Third Gospel. Whatever the authorship of the diary may be, it has been used by the editor of the Acts, who is also the Evangelist, as a source. As such, it has clearly been expanded by cognate matter supplied either by his own personal experiences or by other informants.[3] The whole character of the second half of the Acts is determined by the travel-document. The parallel with what must be said regarding the composition of the Third Gospel, if the Proto-Luke Hypothesis be true, is undoubted. It is even closer still if for the earlier chapters of the Acts the editor is indebted to traditions,[4] or a document[5] which emanated from St. Mark.

[1] Lk. vii. 11–17; Acts xx. 7–12.

[2] Lk. xxii. 25–38; Acts xx. 18–35.

[3] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 169: 'A further stage was the completion of the diary of the journeys with Paul by the intervening narrative of Paul's labours. Was this done by the diarist himself or by some one else?'

[4] Cf. Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, pp. 156 ff. Harnack also traces the writer's debt to Philip and his daughters.

[5] The reference here is to the possibility that the so-called Source A (Acts iii.–iv. 35) is a continuation of the Markan narrative. See *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, p. 146.

Our contention is not that the composition of the Acts supplies a reason for believing in the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, but simply that the latter is supported by the Evangelist's procedure elsewhere, whether Proto-Luke and the diary are his productions or not. The importance of this claim is the assurance which it gives that in the Proto-Luke Hypothesis we are not presenting some strange, unheard-of proposal, but one that is consonant with the Evangelist's methods; what we suggest for the Gospel is reflected in the Acts.

Conclusions regarding the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

The case for the Proto-Luke Hypothesis presented in the preceding pages may be regarded from two points of view. The theory is at once the goal towards which many phenomena within the Gospel point, and it is the explanation by which they are illuminated. The problem is very far from being one of merely subjective criticism, since throughout speculation is controlled by objective facts of a documentary kind. These facts are most clearly seen in the Passion and Resurrection narrative in Lk. xxii. 14–xxiv., because we can compare this section with the parallel story in Mk. xiv.–xvi. 8. In the rest of the Third Gospel, however, Markan and non-Markan sections can be separated, and these require explanation in respect of their mutual relationships. For his Passion narrative the Third Evangelist has edited a non-Markan source, using Mk. as a supplementary authority. This conclusion raises a presumption that much the same is true of the earlier part of the Gospel. Detailed study confirms this presumption. The Second Gospel is used exactly as an additional source would be employed, extracts marked by unity of subject-matter being taken from it. The non-Markan sections are found to be constructed on a common ground-plan, and without violence can be viewed as a connected whole. They are sundered portions of an expanded version of Q, furnished with a Passion narrative. Even if this source is looked upon as a hypothetical document, it is significant that what may be presumed to be its deficiencies are supplied by the Markan sections. Its meagre account of the Galilean ministry is

expanded, miracle- and journey-narratives are added, and descriptions of crowded days in the life of Jesus are inserted. On the view that Mk. is a secondary source, a simple explanation of the omissions from that Gospel is supplied; in addition to the many excellent suggestions which have been made, we can say that what the Third Evangelist omits is what he does not need. More important still, we can show why the 'Markan Omissions' are not required. The contents and the inner connexion of the narratives of the non-Markan source everywhere supply us with the key. Further, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis explains other difficulties which have long confronted students of the Third Gospel. These include the elaborate opening of Lk. iii. 1–2, the position of the Genealogy, the order in which Mk. is followed, the position given to the Sermon at Nazareth, the 'Greater Interpolation', and the Cure of the Blind Man at Jericho. Finally, on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, justice is done to the implications of St. Luke's Preface, which bespeaks real authorship, and not only the manipulation of sources.

These arguments have much cumulative force, especially when we find that the literary procedure presupposed is actually reflected in the composition of the Acts. In so complicated a question it is not to be expected that agreement will be reached in respect of details. Allowing for this, we may justly claim that so many considerations tending in the same direction establish an argument of much cogency. The Markan sections in Lk. are full and important extracts from a highly valued source, but a work more highly valued still, found in the non-Markan portions of the Gospel, is the framework of the whole, and this document is correctly described as Proto-Luke.

§ 2. *The Authorship of Proto-Luke.*

Two questions are involved in considering the authorship of Proto-Luke: (1) Is the author the Third Evangelist? (2) Is the Third Evangelist St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul? It is only the first of these questions to which detailed consideration will be given. I believe that St. Luke is the author both of the Gospel and the Acts, but the issue is too large to be raised

here,[1] and all that will be attempted will be to indicate what follows when the Evangelist is held to be unknown.

(1) The first matter for inquiry is the *style* of Proto-Luke. Does the document possess a linguistic individuality of such a kind as to point to an author distinct from the Evangelist?

Linguistic arguments at present appear to command less sympathy than they received a decade ago.[2] It will therefore be best, instead of examining the Lukan words and phrases discussed by Hawkins[3] and Harnack,[4] to base the inquiry upon a series of Hebraic idioms[5] which Dr. Burney in *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* instanced as a characteristic feature in St. Luke's style (cf. pp. 7 ff.). It may seem precarious to rest the question of style on Semitisms when the researches of Deissmann, Moulton, and Milligan have emphasized the Koiné element in the language of the New Testament, and when the fiction of a 'Biblical Greek' has been exploded. Some reaction, however, has been registered since Dr. Moulton first criticized Dalman's examples of Semitic idiom in the Lukan writings.[6] It has come to be recognized that the attempt to remove Semitisms from the Greek of the New Testament can be carried too far.[7] As regards the Apocalypse, Dr. Moulton himself was influenced by the arguments of R. H. Charles in his book, *Studies in the Apocalypse*,[8] and in Part I of the second volume of the *Grammar* (p. ix) an Appendix[9] was announced which

[1] The most recent discussion of the question, in the light of the views of Prof. H. Windisch and the Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, is that of Canon Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 540 ff.). Cf. also Moffatt's discussion of H. J. Cadbury's examination of the 'medical argument' (*Expositor*, VIII, xxiv, pp. 1–18).

[2] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, pp. 161 ff., 344 ff.

[3] Cf. *H.S.*[2], pp. 15 ff., 174 ff. [4] Cf. *Luke the Physician*, pp. 26 ff., 175 ff.

[5] 'Secondary Semitisms' is probably the better term. See Moulton, *Gk. Gr.*, ii, p. 15. By a 'Hebraism' Burney understands a construction or word-usage found in Biblical Hebrew which, through the influence of the Septuagint, has affected New Testament Greek (*op. cit.*, p. 11). Many of the instances are sufficiently explained as 'the over-use of locutions which can be defended as good Κοινή Greek, but have their motive clearly in their coincidence with locutions of the writer's native tongue' (Moulton, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 474). [6] Cf. Moulton, *Proleg.*, pp. 14 ff.

[7] Cf. Moulton: 'Nothing has emerged, I believe, to shake the general position taken by Deissmann, adopted with some developments in *Prolegomena*, but there are some applications of the principle which I should myself admit to be too rigorous' (*Gk. Gr.*, ii, p. 14). See also Milligan, *NT. Documents*, p. 52. [8] Cf. *I.C.C.*, *Revelation*, pp. x, cxlii.

[9] In the hands of Prof. W. F. Howard this Appendix is now rapidly approaching completion.

should deal with the vexed questions of Semitisms. There can be no doubt that this Appendix will be of very great value to students of New Testament Greek. It is vain to anticipate its detailed findings, but it may reasonably be expected that the broad results of Deissmann and his fellow workers will not seriously be disturbed. What is required is room within the new theory for the idioms to which, in various ways, Wellhausen, Allen, Torrey, Charles, and Burney have called attention.

The 'Hebraisms' which Dr. Burney finds in the Third Gospel and the Acts are characteristic of these writings. 'We observe', he says, 'that they are characteristically Lukan, and in some cases exclusively so' (*op. cit.*, p. 15). It will be seen that this fact, if admitted, supplies us with an excellent test by which to judge the authorship of Proto-Luke, for matters of idiom in estimating style go deeper than the use of characteristic words and phrases. What we have to consider is whether the 'Hebraisms' in Proto-Luke stamp that work as a source which it was the Third Evangelist's good fortune to find and use, or whether it is a document of which he is himself the author. In discussing this question, it will be useful to prepare a table based on the nine examples which Dr. Burney prints on pages 11–15 of his book. The table will distinguish the instances found in Proto-Luke, the Birth Stories of Lk. i., ii., the Markan sections of Lk., the Acts, and the rest of the New Testament.

Notes to opposite page.

[1] Cf. Thackeray, *Gr. of the OT. in Gk.*, pp. 50 f.

[2] Cf. Thackeray, *op. cit.*, pp. 47–50.

[3] Cf. Thackeray, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 f. St. Luke seems to have introduced this characteristic Septuagintism into the narrative, replacing the simple πάλιν of his source (Mk.). W. Schmidt (*De Flavii Josephi Elocutione Observationes Criticae*, p. 516) shows that this is the one Hebraism that can fairly be brought home to Josephus, but points out that he only uses the construction with the infin. following: Burney's 1, never 2.

[4] St. Mark's use of ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην shows that this is not necessarily a Hebraism. It is probably a common phrase of Jesus, taken over from Aramaic into vernacular Greek, in which the confusion of εἰς and ἐν was most frequent.

[5] See *V.G.T.*, p. 220 a.

[6] With reference to Lk. ix. 51, Lagrange writes: 'Le style du v. est spécialement sémitique. Chaque tournure peut s'expliquer par le grec, mais l'ensemble fait impression. . . . Mais tout cela peut s'expliquer par l'influence des Septante' (*Évangile selon Saint Luc*). I owe this reference and the one in note 3 to Prof. Howard.

[7] See *V.G.T.*, p. 159 b, and cf. Eph. iv. 11.

Tabulated in the way suggested, the list is as follows:

	In Proto-Luke.	*In Lk. i., ii.*	*In the Markan sections of Lk*	*In the Acts.*	*In the rest of the NT.*
Ἐγένετο, introducing a time-determination.[1] Cf. Heb. use of וַיְהִי.					9
With verb in the apodosis in the aor. (with or without καί).	14	8	10	1	
With verb in the apodosis in the infinitive.	2	—	2	10	
Enforcement of verb by a cognate substantive in dat.[2] Cf. Heb. use of infin. abs. with finite verb.	1	—	—	2	5
Use of προστίθημι in place of πάλιν, &c.[3] Cf. Heb. use of הוֹסִיף.	1	—	2	1	—
The phrase πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.[4] Cf. Heb. לֵךְ לְשָׁלוֹם.	1	—	1	—	1 (ὕπαγε, Mk. iv. 34).
The expression ἐνώπιον.[5] Cf. לִפְנֵי or לְעֵינֵי.	14	5	3	13	57 (34 in Apoc.).
The phrase πρὸ προσώπου. Cf. לִפְנֵי.	3	1	—	1	2
The phrase τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν.[6] Cf. שִׂים פָּנִים.	1	—	—	—	—
The phrase λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον. Cf. נָשָׂא פָּנִים.	—	—	1	—	1
The use of the verb δίδωμι = 'put', 'set', 'appoint', 'allow', &c.[7] Cf. similar use of נָתַן.	5	—	—	5	—
	42	14	19	33	75
		108			

The table shows that the phrases and idioms in question are found in every part of the Lukan writings—in the Acts, in the Birth and Markan sections, and in Proto-Luke. Thus, in no sense do they distinguish Proto-Luke as the work of a writer other than the Evangelist. On the other hand, we cannot take the further step and claim that these usages prove that the Evangelist is the actual author of Proto-Luke. As a matter of fact, they occur slightly more frequently (proportionately) in the Markan sections, and here we know that the Evangelist is editing a source.[1] Thus, so far as the linguistic evidence is concerned, the possibility still lies open that in the case of Proto-Luke he is also the editor of a source. To test this possibility we have to pass beyond linguistic considerations. It is of value, however, to find that what must be regarded as a characteristic use of Hebrew idiom is no peculiarity of Proto-Luke; there is no positive evidence in the style of the document pointing to a non-Lukan writer.

The conclusion just stated is the more interesting because it is the opposite of that which is reached by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet regarding the authorship of the non-Markan source which he calls S (see pp. 12 ff.). Dr. Bartlet's view is that the Semitic phrases in S, especially those of the ἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτός type, bulk so largely as to point to a source which St. Luke used, rather than a document of which he is the direct author.[2] This difference of opinion is less serious than it might at first sight appear to be; it is largely accounted for by the considerable dimensions assigned to S by Dr. Bartlet. S includes many passages which we have found reason to view as 'Markan sections' in Lk. As defined in the present work, Proto-Luke is a much shorter document than S, with the result that it contains fewer examples of the phrases cited. Not only so, on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis many of the Hebraisms in question occur in places where the Evangelist is reproducing Mk.; they

[1] The Markan sections in Lk. amount to 297 verses, while Proto-Luke contains 702 verses. The proportion in which the phrases in the table occur in the former as compared with the latter will be found to be 6·4 : 5·9. On the same basis of calculation, the percentage in Lk. i., ii. is slightly more than 10, and in the entire Gospel it is 6·5.

[2] Cf. *O.S.S.*, pp. 316–22, 334, 337, 350.

are introduced by him into the Markan matter which he uses. Thus, whatever may be the case regarding S, these Semitisms do not stamp Proto-Luke as the work of a writer other than the Evangelist. *They are incidental to the Biblical style which, influenced by the Septuagint, he has adopted in recording the story of Jesus.*

(2) Turning from matters of style, we must next give consideration to some of the *characteristic ideas* of Proto-Luke. Here again there do not appear to be adequate grounds for distinguishing the Evangelist from the author of Proto-Luke. Among the features which mark the individuality of S, Dr. Bartlet drew attention to (1) the Hebraic idea that the disciples' obtuseness to the forecasts of the Passion is due in part to Divine action (xviii. 34, xxiv. 16, 45), and (2) the reference to the fulfilment of Scripture in the career of Jesus (xxii. 37, xxiv. 25–7, 44–6. Cf. ix. 31, xii. 50, xiii. 32, xxii. 22). The passages cited will show that these ideas occur in the Markan sections as well as in Proto-Luke; we cannot say that they give to Proto-Luke an individuality which is not that of the Evangelist's writings. This view, indeed, is conclusively substantiated by what we find in the Acts. Here we cannot expect to find references to the disciples' failure to understand the forecasts of the Passion, but it is significant that in the opening chapter they are described as asking, 'Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts i. 6). So far as references to the fulfilment of Scripture in the career of Jesus are concerned, at least a dozen[1] passages in the Acts can be cited, of which three (iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f.) refer to the Passion in terms which recall Lk. xxiv. 25–7, 44–6. When we pass to other outstanding ideas in Proto-Luke, it speedily becomes clear that, if it is not the work of St. Luke's pen, we have to think of its author as the Evangelist's double. Like St. Luke he is interested in the poor, in women, in outcasts and sinners; he thinks of Christ as the Saviour of the world and the Healer of men. We have to think of this unknown writer as one who by selective affinity is able to shape a source already prepared for easy assimilation by the

[1] Acts i. 16, ii. 25 ff., iii. 18, 22, viii. 35, x. 43, xiii. 33, 34, 35, xvii. 3, xviii. 28, xxvi. 22 f. Cf. also ii. 23, iii. 24, xvii. 11.

Evangelist. Like Dr. Bartlet's source S, Proto-Luke, on this view, has to be thought of either as written specially for St. Luke, or as taken down by him, virtually from his informant's lips (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 350). Surely there is a gain in simplicity and in truth if we dispense with this unknown author, and think of St. Luke himself as the author of Proto-Luke.

(3) In the third place, the *literary connexions* which have been made between Q matter and material peculiar to the Gospel call for notice. Is there any advantage in supposing that St. Luke found these connexions already established in a source? So far as the parables characteristic of the Third Gospel are concerned, Dr. Bartlet thinks that this is so. He selects as a crucial example the Parable of the Good Samaritan, which immediately follows the Q passage about the Great Commandment (Lk. x. 25–8). Dr. Bartlet thinks that whoever has conjoined the two, this person is not St. Luke (*op. cit.*, p. 346 f.). In support of this view, he points to (1) the natural way in which the parable springs out of x. 28 ('This do, and thou shalt live'); (2) the fact that the words of transition, 'But he, wishing to justify himself . . .', have a parallel in the words of Jesus in xvi. 15 ('Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men'); (3) the dialogue form in verse 36 f. which presupposes the situation described in x. 25–8; (4) the fact that x. 25–8 is so far out of its Markan context. It is by no means apparent that any or all of these facts prevent us from ascribing the conjunction of the two passages to St. Luke. Why should he be thought incapable of effecting the excellent connexion that is made? The Parable of the Good Samaritan is one of the nine passages which, on linguistic grounds, Dr. Stanton claimed as the work of St. Luke (*G.H.D.*, ii. 309 ff.). If we accept this view, no satisfactory case can be made out for the assertion that x. 25–37 may have stood as a unit in a single source on which St. Luke drew, nor can we continue the argument (with Bartlet) and urge that, because the other Lukan parables open in the same manner ('A certain man', &c.), 'they, too, came to Luke already united with his QL matter in the special source' (*op. cit.*, p. 348). No one, of course, can prove, or would be asked to prove, that in every case St. Luke has made the existing connexions, but

there is no reason to think that the majority of them, or even very many of them, cannot have been made by him; and to prove this is indispensable if he is not to be regarded as the author of Proto-Luke.

Is it possible to find signs of another hand in the grouping of paragraphs in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14, the so-called 'Greater Interpolation'? Here, as we have seen, there are many close connexions[1] between successive sections, and Dr. Stanton lent the weight of his great authority to the opinion that in many cases St. Luke found these already established in the expanded Logian document (*G.H.D.*, ii. 228 f.). Reference was made to this opinion in Chapter I (p. 9 f.), but the question was left over for later discussion and must now be faced. Dr. Stanton's argument is an inference suggested by St. Luke's use of Mk.: 'Now it should be observed that in parallels with St. Mark, our third evangelist is careful not to create connexions in time which he did not find in his source' (*op. cit.*, p. 228). The inference, of course, is that the many temporal links in ix. 51–xviii. 14 were found by the Evangelist already existing in a source, and were not created by him. In pressing this argument, it has not been sufficiently observed that, in the reference to Mk., the conclusion is virtually assumed. The real question is whether the parallel is permissible; whether St. Luke's procedure in ix. 51–xviii. 14 and in the Markan sections of his Gospel is the same. If, as the Proto-Luke Hypothesis implies, Mk. is used by the Third Evangelist as a supplementary source, we can only argue from his treatment of this source with considerable qualifications. A source which is utilized for the sake of the material which it contains, rather than for its framework, will not supply us with an adequate criterion for judging the temporal connexions in Proto-Luke. It may be that St. Luke used an expanded version of Q, an opinion for which Dr. Stanton has presented a strong argument (*op. cit.*, p. 239). In this case, some of the literary connexions in Proto-Luke may well be explained in the way suggested. St. Luke found them in his version of Q; he did not create them. This admission, however, will leave untouched the probability that many others are the work of the

[1] Cf. xi. 27, 37, 53, xii. 1, 13, xiii. 1, 31, xvi. 14.

Evangelist, effected either on information supplied by oral tradition, or as the result of inference; he has not merely copied Proto-Luke, but given it definite form and shape.

(4) The strongest objection, however, to the view that St. Luke is not the author of Proto-Luke is that, on this view, *the Evangelist's part in the formation of the Third Gospel* is reduced to a minimum. We have already argued that the Proto-Luke Hypothesis fully satisfies the implications of St. Luke's Preface (p. 197 f.). There is force in this contention even if the Evangelist is not the author of Proto-Luke, but obviously it is at its strongest if the contrary is true. This was our argument in criticizing Dr. Bartlet's view of the authorship of his source S (p. 17), and it applies with equal cogency in the case of Proto-Luke. In the light of Lk. i. 1–4 it is impossible to think that the Evangelist's task is summed up in the work of knitting together two documents, neither of which is his own composition, and of making the necessary editorial and stylistic modifications which are involved. Room has to be left for a larger share in the composition of the Gospel on the Evangelist's part. In his extremely valuable note on παρηκολουθηκότι (Lk. i. 3), Dr. H. J. Cadbury, while denying to the word the sense of deliberate investigation, favours a closer relation to the events described than that obtained by special reading and study.[1] He even thinks it possible to render the Evangelist's meaning by the paraphrase: 'Many have recorded it; eyewitnesses and participants have transmitted it; I also, as one well informed, will narrate it.'[2] The Evangelist's knowledge is not that of an eyewitness, but it is more than that of 'the many' who have sought to draw up a narrative of the early Christian tradition, and with whom he classes himself. He is an author, and neither an editor nor a redactor. If, then, we are right in affirming the existence of Proto-Luke, we must think of the Evangelist as in the full sense of the term the author of that work. Whether we look at the style of Proto-Luke, its characteristic ideas, the connexions between its sections, or the implications of St. Luke's Preface, the probabilities of the case point in this direction.

[1] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. ii, pp. 501 ff.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 510.

§ 3. *The Date and Place of Composition of Proto-Luke.*

The questions of the date and place of composition of Proto-Luke are bound up with the fact that the work rests upon early Palestinian tradition. The features which imply the influence of this tradition are as follows:

(1) The prominence of Jerusalem, and especially the detailed account of the Passion and of the Post-Resurrection Appearances.

(2) The active part played by a company of women who attend Jesus and His disciples during a preaching-tour throughout the cities and villages of Galilee, and who journey with Him to Jerusalem and play an important part in connexion with the Burial and the Resurrection (cf. viii. 1–3, xxiii. 55, xxiv. 1–11, 22 f.).

(3) The special knowledge that is shown of Herod's court (cf. viii. 3, xiii. 31 f., xxiii. 6–12).

(4) The knowledge implied of a band of disciples larger than the Twelve, sent out by Jesus upon a missionary tour (x. 1–24; cf. xxii. 14, 35–8).

(5) The knowledge displayed of traditions associated with Samaria and the Samaritans (cf. ix. 51–6, x. 29–37, xvii. 11–19).

In view of the features in the above list, it is not surprising that many scholars have suggested the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist as the intermediaries through whom St. Luke obtained much of the material peculiar to his Gospel.[1] From Philip's daughters St. Luke may well have obtained the information which could easily be supplied by such eyewitnesses as Joanna the wife of Chuza, Susanna, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James (viii. 3, xxiv. 10). Philip, moreover, was pre-eminently the Evangelist of Samaria (Acts viii. 4–7, 26–40).[2] The reason for ascribing special importance to the daughters of Philip is twofold: (1) they were capable of supplying the

[1] Cf. Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 157, Streeter, *O.S.S.*, p. 224, Bartlet, *O.S.S.*, p. 351 ff., and Sanday, *O.S.S.*, p. xxi.

[2] 'The Evangelist of Samaria was, too, the most likely of media for traditions touching Jesus and the Samaritans' (*op. cit.*, p. 352).

information to which reference has been made, and (2) direct contact with them on the part of the author of the 'We-Sections' is implied in Acts xxi. 8 ff.[1] If St. Luke is the diarist of the Acts and the companion of St. Paul, he actually resided some days in the house of Philip at Caesarea (Acts xxi. 10), and after accompanying the Apostle on his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 15), it is probable that he remained during the two years, or some part of them, that St. Paul was detained there (cf. Acts xxiii. 31–3, xxiv. 27, xxvii. 1). Thus, on the view that St. Luke is the author of the 'We-Sections', he was present at Jerusalem and Caesarea about the year A. D. 60, and was brought into touch at these places with those well able to supply the information which lies behind the Proto-Luke document. Strictly speaking, however, we ought to regard this date as the earliest time to which Proto-Luke can be ascribed, and to leave open the possibility that the actual writing of the work may have been carried out a few years later. The lower limit is the time when St. Luke first read the Second Gospel, for by this time Proto-Luke existed in writing. If we date St. Mark's Gospel about the year A. D. 68, we must think of the seventh decade as the period when Proto-Luke was compiled. It is probably a few years earlier than Mk., for it is not easy to think that a long interval would elapse after St. Luke's visit to Caesarea before its composition. There may, of course, have been no interval at all, but it is safer to set down A. D. 60–5 as the date of Proto-Luke. Notes would doubtless be made at Caesarea, but that Proto-Luke was actually compiled there is open to question. One feels that further efforts would have been made to expand the account of the earlier Galilean period, had St. Luke been in immediate touch with his informants at the actual time of writing. The impression which Proto-Luke leaves upon the mind is that its author was following excellent tradition on certain lines, but was well aware of his limitations in respect of others. Proto-Luke reads exactly like the first draft of a great work; it is excellent, but incomplete. We

[1] 'And on the morrow we departed, and came unto Caesarea: and entering into the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven, we abode with him. Now this man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus' (Acts xxi. 8–10).

account for this if we date the actual composition of the work after the departure from Caesarea. From Caesarea St. Luke carried with him valuable tradition, but the living voice was no longer at his command. Such at least are the inferences which Proto-Luke itself suggests. The incompleteness of the work will also explain why it never passed into circulation as a separate entity. No longer in touch with his intermediaries, St. Luke could proceed no farther with his task until he lighted upon the Gospel of St. Mark. Such a suggestion is to be preferred, or at any rate added to the view that Proto-Luke was written not immediately for the literary purpose to which it was finally put, but rather as a record for St. Luke's use as an evangelist or teacher.[1] For these reasons we date Proto-Luke A. D. 60–5, and look upon Caesarea as the place where the first steps were taken, rather than the actual place of composition.

At this point we may ask the question: What difference does it make to the theory, if we look upon the Third Evangelist as unknown? In this case, in view of the arguments already presented in Section 2 of the present chapter, the Evangelist is still the author of Proto-Luke, but he is not the diarist whose work is embodied in the Acts. On this view, Proto-Luke must still be dated earlier than the time when its author read Mk. We can no longer, however, bring the Evangelist into direct touch with the daughters of Philip, nor can we insist upon Caesarea as the place where he obtained his information and began his work. If the Evangelist is unknown, it is possible that Proto-Luke must be dated a little later, but not very much later. We have less reason to think of the beginning of the seventh decade as the time of composition, but in view of the date of Mk. we cannot descend lower than about A. D. 65–70. So far then as the date of Proto-Luke is concerned, little difference is made whether its author is St. Luke or some unknown writer. Much the same is true of the author's informants and of the place of composition. In view of the contents of Proto-Luke, we must still think of women as the intermediaries through whom its special tradition was received, though there is less reason to single out the

[1] Dr. Bartlet (*op. cit.*, p. 351) makes this excellent suggestion as regards the purpose of S. Obviously, the same suggestion can readily be transferred to Proto-Luke.

daughters of Philip or to fix upon Caesarea as the place where the first steps in its production were taken.

On either view, the theory that women who had companied with Jesus and His disciples were the author's ultimate authorities holds the field. Of the narratives of Proto-Luke previous to the story of the Passion, a very considerable number are stories about women. In the Galilean period the list includes the Raising of the Widow's Son, the Woman in the City, and the reference to the preaching-tour in viii. 1–3. Even the Sermon at Nazareth contains a reference to a woman, the widow at Zarephath (iv. 26). After ix. 51 there are the stories of Martha and Mary (x. 38–42), of the woman who cried, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee' (xi. 27 f.), and of the Cure of the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity (xiii. 10–13); and to these we may add the Parables of the Lost Coin (xv. 8–10) and of the Unjust Judge (xviii. 1–8). Within the Passion narrative there is the account of the women who bewailed Jesus as He was on His way to the Cross (xxiii. 27–31), and there is the fuller information (as compared with Mk.) regarding the activity of the women in connexion with the Burial of Jesus and the Visit to the Tomb (xxiii. 55 f., xxiv. 1–11). The story of the Trial before Herod (xxiii. 6–12) may also have been supplied on the authority of women (cf. viii. 1–3). The inferences suggested by these various narratives[1] have often been drawn in connexion with the character and authorship of the Third Gospel, but obviously their force is very much stronger in relation to Proto-Luke, the shorter work. Proto-Luke is pre-eminently the Gospel of Woman, and it is to the witness borne by women who saw and heard that Criticism must attribute the earliest attempt to tell the Story of Jesus.

Note on the Text of Proto-Luke.

How far can the text of Proto-Luke, as we find it in the Third Gospel, be relied upon as giving a substantially accurate version of the original work? It is not likely, I think, that the margin of difference will be great. This, at any rate, is the inference which is suggested

[1] In an interesting article (*E.T.*, Feb. 1923, p. 233 f.) the Rev. C. E. Charlesworth has made out a good case for thinking that the unnamed disciple in the story of the Journey to Emmaus was the wife of Cleopas.

when we compare the degree of editorial modification to which St. Luke has subjected Mk. and Q.

Since Harnack's *Sprüche und Reden*, a good deal of scepticism has been expressed regarding the precise nature of the editorial changes[1] effected by the Evangelist in the text of Q, but the general character of those changes is not seriously in dispute. So far as Mk. is concerned, and probably also in the case of Q, these modifications are almost entirely stylistic and editorial. Characteristic Lukan words and phrases are inserted, uncouth expressions and redundancies are expunged, and the style of the whole is made smoother (cf. H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, pp. 79 ff., 83 ff., 96 ff., &c.). Occasionally, new facts are mentioned which are suggested by inferences or by additional information (e. g. the additions in the stories of the Transfiguration, ix. 28–36, and the Cure of the Epileptic Lad, ix. 37–43). Sayings are sometimes given in a more summary form (cf. viii. 21), though now and again the reverse is true (cf. xx. 34–6). More material alterations do not appear to be numerous, the introduction of the reference to the Holy Spirit in xi. 13 being one of the most noticeable. A number of changes which are perhaps due to religious motives have been cited by Dr. H. J. Cadbury (*op. cit.*, pp. 90 ff.), but they are chiefly omissions. 'The words of Jesus themselves, the *verba ipsissima*, whether reported by Mark or found in the source designated as Q, have rarely been retouched by the author of the third Gospel to give them a wider scope or application' (Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 124).

The changes noted above represent the maximum amount of variation which can be expected in the present text of Proto-Luke, but in point of fact it is certain that the actual amount of variation is very much less. For in the case of Mk. and Q, St. Luke is editing sources which are the work of others, while Proto-Luke is his own production. It does not appear likely, therefore, that the amount of editorial modification will have been considerable. Something appears to have been excised before the beginning of the story of the Last Supper in xxii. 14 (see pp. 178 ff.), and we cannot be certain of the exact text in xxii. 52–3 (Christ's words to His captors, see p. 46 f.) and in xxiii. 49, 55 (the reference to the women present at the Crucifixion and Burial, see pp. 59, 63). With these exceptions, however, the present text of Proto-Luke, as we find it in Lk., probably in the main represents the original document with very considerable fidelity.

[1] A fresh interest is given to this question by Streeter's recent claim that the variations in Mt. and Lk. are to be explained by the use of parallel versions of the sayings of Jesus (e. g. Q, M, and L) rather than by the editorial modification of Q by the First and Third Evangelists. Cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 238 ff.

IX

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF PROTO-LUKE

In the present chapter we pass on to consider the wider historical questions raised by Proto-Luke. It is beyond question, of course, that in source-criticism historical presuppositions cannot be allowed to prejudice the free discussion of the literary phenomena. Nevertheless, if theories when applied stand in violent opposition to historical conclusions otherwise well established, we are bound to return to the task of literary criticism with the suspicion that something has been overlooked or wrongly valued. Moreover, for the purpose of evaluating a theory, we need to know what results follow when it is accepted. There is thus the need, even in presenting the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, of a treatment which includes the historical aspect of the question.

There are special reasons why the historical aspect of the question is important. For the last three decades, thanks to the labours of Ramsay, Hawkins, Harnack, and Stanton, critical estimates of the historical value of the Lukan writings have been steadily rising. Even the reaction manifest in *The Beginnings of Christianity* witnesses how far Criticism has moved since the days of the Tübingen School (cf. Pt. I, vol. ii, pp. 298–309). It is essential, therefore, that we should ask what place the Proto-Luke Theory may be thought to occupy in the development of critical opinion. For in spite of the tributes which are paid to St. Luke as a historian, the criticism of the Acts still suffers from strictures which are passed upon the writer from his supposed procedure in the Gospel. A recent illustration of this fact may be supplied from the lectures delivered by Dr. F. C. Burkitt[1] before the London University in February, 1924, which is all the more interesting because the lecturer has presented a strong

[1] *Christian Beginnings* (1924).

argument in favour of the Jerusalem tradition of the Post-Resurrection Appearances of Jesus, which is characteristic of Lk. and the Acts. 'We cannot suppose', writes Dr. Burkitt, 'that "Acts" is more accurate than "Luke", and if in studying the Gospel history we again and again follow Mark rather than Luke as a guide to our own reconstruction of the course of events, or perceive only too clearly that Luke has blurred the sharp outlines of the document upon which his own narrative is based, we cannot hope that he will always be a safe guide in "Acts" where we have no Mark to check his statements.'[1] No clearer statement could be desired of an issue from which there is no escape so long as we think of Mk. as St. Luke's principal source. The question at once arises, How far have we reason to modify this opinion, if the Proto-Luke Theory be true? and to answer this question we require to treat, not only the literary phenomena on which the theory rests, but also its historical bearings.

The discussion of Proto-Luke on its historical side falls naturally into four parts. Thus:

(1) There are many cases in which Proto-Luke is in agreement with St. Mark's Gospel.

(2) There are other cases, some of them of great importance, in which the agreement is with the Fourth Gospel.

(3) There are also cases in which Proto-Luke either is, or appears to be, in conflict with our other authorities, and in certain points even with the Third Gospel itself.

(4) In several respects Proto-Luke stands alone, vouching for matter peculiar to itself.

Already it is apparent that to postulate Proto-Luke as an historical authority may involve loss as well as gain, unsettlement as well as confirmation. This, however, is the inevitable result of introducing a new authority into an historical problem. Things cannot remain as they were before; the waters are troubled as well as quickened, and if the stream is made deeper and broader, in some respects its course will be changed. The fortunate discovery of a new Gospel in some Eastern

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 54 f.

monastery, comparable in authority with the Synoptic Gospels, would certainly raise difficulties. In many matters, we may be sure, our present knowledge would receive welcome confirmation; in respect of others, we should undoubtedly be called upon to think again. The chief gains of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis are probably those which are least sensational. As an illustration, reference may be made to those instances in which its witness agrees with that of Mk. In these cases no fresh information is supplied, but what we already know is confirmed by independent testimony. In a sense the Proto-Luke Hypothesis permits us to return to an older apologetic which the development of New Testament Criticism had compelled us to discard. The days are gone for ever when it was possible to say, Here are four separate witnesses to the same events! Criticism has reduced the four to two,[1] Mk. and Jn., and regards the latter as a doubtful ally. If the theory presented in these pages is accepted, we may now claim a third separate authority in Proto-Luke, which in many important matters agrees with Mk. and in certain respects confirms the value of Jn. as an historical authority.

§ 1. *Points of Agreement between Proto-Luke and St. Mark's Gospel.*

In view of the importance of the agreement between Proto-Luke and Mk., it is desirable to inquire how far it extends and what it includes. The agreement is naturally at its greatest in the Passion narrative, where the two authorities run side by side, but when we remember the limitations of Proto-Luke in the period leading up to the Passion, it is remarkable how frequently the two documents agree elsewhere.

For the account of the ministry of John the Baptist, the Baptism, and the Temptation, it is probable that Proto-Luke is dependent on Q.[2] All that calls for notice here is its agreement with Mk., as against Mt., in describing John's baptism as 'the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins', and in the detail about loosing the latchet of the shoes of the Coming One.

[1] Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *G.H.T.*, p. 132.
[2] See p. 76 f.

These details are either common to Q and Mk. or they are Markan additions to Proto-Luke. In Proto-Luke it is not said whence Jesus came to be baptized, and the emphasis lies on the opening of the heaven, the descent of the Spirit, and the Voice, the Baptism itself being mentioned almost in passing (iii. 21). Leaving the Temptation and the Departure to Galilee, where there are important differences to be considered later, we find our two authorities at one in the opinion that the first disciples were the fishermen Simon Peter, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee.[1] From both documents we learn also of the great crowds from Judaea, Jerusalem, and even from the neighbourhood about Tyre and Sidon,[2] which came to hear Jesus and to be healed of their diseases. The choice of the Twelve from a larger number of the followers of Jesus is also a fact which probably Mk. and Proto-Luke independently record.[3]

From this point onward, until we come to the final approach of Jesus and His disciples to Jerusalem, it is no longer possible to compare Mk. and Proto-Luke in respect of the order of events. All that we can do is to note important opinions and implications in which the two coincide. Thus, both tell us of the association of Jesus with Capernaum[4] and with Nazareth,[5] and of the preaching-tours which He undertook accompanied by His followers among the cities and villages of Galilee.[6] From both we learn that Jesus taught in synagogues,[7] that vast crowds[8] gathered to hear Him, and that the freshness and wonder of His preaching occasioned great and far-reaching popularity.[9] In both we read of the hostility of the scribes and Pharisees,[10] although in Proto-Luke there are several references to hospitality provided by Pharisees.[11] Contrasted with the attitude of the scribes and Pharisees is that of the publicans and sinners, though it is in Proto-Luke that this receives the greater emphasis.[12] Both documents tell us of controversies regarding the Sabbath

[1] Lk. v. 1–11 ; cf. Mk. i. 16–20.
[2] Lk. vi. 17 ; cf. Mk. iii. 7 f.
[3] See p. 81 f.
[4] Lk. vii. 1 ; cf. Mk. i. 21.
[5] Lk. iv. 16 ff. ; cf. Mk. vi. 1 ff.
[6] Lk. viii. 1–3 ; cf. Mk. i. 38 f.
[7] Lk. iv. 16 ff., xiii. 10 ff. ; cf. Mk. i. 21 ff., iii. 1 ff.
[8] Lk. xii. 1, 54, xiii. 17, &c. ; cf. Mk. i. 37, 45, ii. 2, &c.
[9] Lk. iv. 14 f., 20, 22, xiii. 17 ; cf. Mk. i. 28, 37, ii. 12, &c.
[10] Lk. xi. 53 f., xii. 1, xv. 1 ; cf. Mk. iii. 6, 22, vii. 1 ff., &c.
[11] Lk. vii. 36 ff., xi. 37 ff., xiv. 1.
[12] Lk. vii. 36 ff., xv. 11 ff., xviii. 9 f., xix. 1–10.

which are associated with miracles of healing,[1] and both speak repeatedly of the miracles of Jesus. In each there is a story of the raising of the dead,[2] a cure wrought at a distance,[3] and both either tell or imply that Jesus healed lepers,[4] restored sight to the blind,[5] and cast out evil spirits.[6] Independently of each other, they both contain the section on the charge of collusion with Beelzebub [7] and the teaching of Jesus regarding blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.[8] Both speak of the Coming of the Son of man [9] and of the duty of watchfulness.[10] They also agree in reflecting the set purpose with which Jesus undertook His last journey to Jerusalem.[11] Each illustrates the interest of Jesus in children,[12] His concern for individuals,[13] His attitude towards the impetuosity of the Twelve,[14] His point of view when asked to give a sign from heaven.[15] Taken alone, each of these agreements is small, yet viewed together they go to make up a definite portraiture of Jesus which increases in value the more it is confirmed by independent witnesses.

It is, however, in the account of the Passion and the Resurrection that the agreement of Proto-Luke and Mk. is most important of all. Both agree that a last meal was partaken of by Jesus and His disciples on the night before His Crucifixion, during which, under circumstances of special solemnity, a cup was passed round and shared.[16] They agree that during this meal reference was made by Jesus to His approaching betrayal by one of the Twelve;[17] they also agree, though they place the reference differently, that Jesus foresaw the defection of Peter.[18] They are at one in relating that after leaving the city, Jesus sought a place of retirement for prayer;[19] that, while His disciples slept,

[1] Lk. xiii. 10 ff., xiv. 1 ff.; cf. Mk. ii. 23 ff., iii. 1 ff.
[2] Lk. vii. 11 ff.; cf. Mk. v. 21 ff.
[3] Lk. vii. 1 ff.; cf. Mk. vii. 24 ff.
[4] Lk. xvii. 11 ff., vii. 22; cf. Mk. i. 40 ff.
[5] Lk. vii. 21, 22; cf. Mk. viii. 22 f., x. 46 ff.
[6] Lk. vii. 21, viii. 3; cf. Mk. i. 21 ff., 34, 39, &c.
[7] Lk. xi. 14 ff.; cf. Mk. iii. 22 ff.
[8] Lk. xii. 10; cf. Mk. iii. 28 ff.
[9] Lk. xvii. 22–37; cf. Mk. xiii. 21 ff.
[10] Lk. xii. 35 ff.; cf. Mk. xiii. 33 ff.
[11] Lk. ix. 51; cf. Mk. x. 32.
[12] Lk. vii. 32; cf. Mk. ix. 36 f., x. 13 ff.
[13] Lk. vii. 11 ff., 36 ff., x. 38 ff., &c.; cf. Mk. vii. 31 ff., viii. 22 ff., &c.
[14] Lk. ix. 55 f.; cf. Mk. x. 35 ff.
[15] Lk. xi. 16, 29 f.; cf. Mk. viii. 11 f.
[16] Lk. xxii. 14–18; cf. Mk. xiv. 22–5.
[17] Lk. xxii. 21, 23; cf. Mk. xiv. 18–21.
[18] Lk. xxii. 31–3; cf. Mk. xiv. 29–31.
[19] Lk. xxii. 39 ff.; cf. Mk. xiv. 32 ff.

He prayed that His cup might be taken away; and that in filial obedience He submitted Himself to His Father's will.[1] From both we learn of the treachery of Judas;[2] of the violence done to the high priest's servant;[3] of the arrest and of the journey to the high priest's house.[4] With important differences as to time, each tells of the arraignment of Jesus before the priests, and of the fact that His condemnation was made to turn on an extorted confession of Messiahship.[5] Each tells of a trial before Pilate, the Roman governor;[6] of Barabbas;[7] and, though they disagree as to the occasion and the agents, of the mocking and reviling of Jesus.[8] Each tells of malefactors crucified with Jesus, the one on the right hand and the other on the left hand;[9] of the indignities to which He was subjected while hanging on the cross;[10] of the loud cry with which He died;[11] and of the spontaneous confession of the centurion.[12] From both we learn of the presence of women from Galilee;[13] of the spices which they brought to the tomb on the first day of the week;[14] of the stone that was rolled away;[15] and of a message which they received.[16] Remembering the striking differences which exist between the two accounts, we must allow that there are also important and striking agreements, and that the whole story of the Passion and Resurrection gains from the point of view of verification if, as we affirm, the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is true.

§ 2. *Points of Agreement between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel.*

The relationships between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel are extremely interesting and important. There is little reason to suppose that the Fourth Evangelist knew Proto-Luke, and it is not certain that he had read the Third Gospel. None the less, there are striking parallels between Lk. and Jn., and for our

[1] Lk. xxii. 39 ff.; cf. Mk. xiv. 32 ff.
[2] Lk. xxii. 47; cf. Mk. xiv. 43.
[3] Lk. xxii. 50 f.; cf. Mk. xiv. 47.
[4] Lk. xxii. 54; cf. Mk. xiv. 53.
[5] Lk. xxii. 66 ff.; cf. Mk. xiv. 55 ff.
[6] Lk. xxiii. 1 ff.; cf. Mk. xv. 1 ff.
[7] Lk. xxiii. 18 f.; cf. Mk. xv. 7 f.
[8] Lk. xxii. 63 ff.; cf. Mk. xiv. 65.
[9] Lk. xxiii. 33; cf. Mk. xv. 27.
[10] Lk. xxiii. 33–43; cf. Mk. xv. 21–32.
[11] Lk. xxiii. 46; cf. Mk. xv. 37.
[12] Lk. xxiii. 47; cf. Mk. xv. 39.
[13] Lk. xxiii. 49; cf. Mk. xv. 40 f.
[14] Lk. xxiv. 1; cf. Mk. xvi. 1.
[15] Lk. xxiv. 2; cf. Mk. xvi. 4.
[16] Lk. xxiv. 5 ff.; cf. Mk. xvi. 6 f.

purpose the interest of the relationship lies in the fact that most of the Lukan phenomena which bear upon the question appear in Proto-Luke.

The linguistic aspect is the least important side of the question. According to Harnack there are only eighty-eight words, common to Jn. and the Lukan writings, which are not found in Mt. and Mk.[1] Recognizing the limited vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel, Harnack nevertheless concludes that 'no traces of the dependence of St. John upon the Lukan writings can be discovered by means of the lexicon'.[2] He points out that scarcely a single word characteristic of St. Luke can be found in Jn., and that the language of St. John shows no trace of the influence of the Lukan style.[3] On other grounds, however, Harnack is prepared to leave open the possibility that the Fourth Evangelist had read Lk. and the Acts.[4]

In treating the question under review, it will be advantageous to have a complete list of the features common to Lk. and Jn. which are also found in Proto-Luke. Obviously, the items in such a list must be of varying importance; some of them are mere coincidences, but there are others which cannot possibly be explained in this way.

List of Features common to Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel.

1. The references to Annas (Lk. iii. 3, Jn. xviii. 13, 24).
2. The interest taken in the Baptist, and especially in the question whether he is the Christ (Lk. iii. 15, Jn. i. 19 ff.).
3. Instances in which Jesus eludes a crowd (Lk. iv. 29 f., Jn. viii. 59).
4. The comparatively slight treatment given to the Galilean Ministry.
5. Parallels in the story of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (Lk. v. 1–11) and the story of the Rehabilitation of Peter (Jn. xxi. 1–19).

[1] See Appendix IV in *Luke the Physician*, p. 230.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 231.

[3] Probably the only word peculiar to Proto-Luke and Jn. which is of any importance is the word ἐκμάσσειν, which occurs in the story of the Woman in the City (Lk. vii. 36 ff.) and in the Johannine account of the Anointing at Bethany (Jn. xii. 1 ff.). Other words of interest include ἀριστάω, γείτων, κῆπος, ποτέ, προτρέχω, στῆθος, ἰᾶσθαι (act.), κόλπος, οἱ φίλοι, σουδάριον. Moffatt's opinion of the linguistic parallels is more favourable: 'Both have a remarkable common element in their vocabulary' (*I.N.T.*, p. 535).

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 231.

6. Parallels in the story of the Centurion's Servant (Lk. vii. 1 ff.) and the account of the Nobleman's Son (Jn. iv. 46 ff.). In both cases the sufferer is 'at the point of death'. Cf. Mt. viii. 6—'sick of the palsy, grievously tormented'.

7. Parallels in the story of the Woman in the City (Lk. vii. 36 ff.) and the narrative of the Anointing at Bethany (Jn. xii. 1 ff.). In both narratives the feet of Jesus are anointed and wiped with hair. Cf. Mk. xiv. 3—'and poured it over his head'.

8. The references to Martha and Mary (Lk. x. 38–42, Jn. xi. and xii.).

9. The interest taken in Samaritan incidents (Lk. ix. 51 ff., x. 30–7, xvii. 11–19, Jn. iv. 1–42).

10. The absence of the story of the Cleansing in connexion with the last visit of Jesus to Jerusalem.

11. The agreement regarding the date of the Supper.

12. The partial correspondence between the discourse on True Greatness (Lk. xxii. 24–7) and the story of the Feet Washing (Jn. xiii. 1–17).

13. The reference to the Denial of Jesus by Peter in close connexion with the Supper (Lk. xxii. 31 f., Jn. xiii. 37 f.).

14. The reference to the restoration of Peter after the Denial (Lk. xxii. 32) and the story of Jn. xxi. 15–17.

15. The reference to the high priest's servant's 'right' ear (Lk. xxii. 50, Jn. xviii. 10).

16. The threefold vindication of Jesus by Pilate (Lk. xxiii. 4, 14, 22; cf. Jn. xviii. 38, xix. 4, 6).

17. The description of the tomb as one 'where never man had yet lain' (Lk. xxiii. 53, cf. Jn. xix. 41) and the reference to two angels at the tomb (Lk. xxiv. 4, cf. Jn. xx. 12).

18. The locating of the Appearances of the Risen Christ at Jerusalem (Lk. xxiv., Jn. xx.).

19. The emphasis upon the physical aspect of the Resurrection Body of Jesus (Lk. xxiv. 39–43, Jn. xx. 27).

20. The possibility that both imply the idea of the Ascension as taking place on the same day as the Resurrection itself (Lk. xxiv. 50–3; cf. Jn. xx. 17, 20, 27).

21. In addition to the above, Proto-Luke and Jn. agree in using ὁ κύριος of Jesus in narrative; in referring to Him as the 'son of Joseph' (Lk. iv. 22, Jn. i. 45, vi. 42); in describing the disciples as 'the friends' of Jesus (Lk. xii. 4, Jn. xv. 14 f.); in speaking of cross-bearing (Lk. xiv. 27, Jn. xix. 17), of the 'love of God' (Lk. xi. 42, Jn. v. 42), and of the inability of the witness of one raised from the dead to convince Jews (Lk. xvi. 30 f., Jn. xii. 10 f.). There are also important agreements of a doctrinal kind, but these do not call for notice here.

The inferences which may be legitimately drawn from the parallels between Lk. and Jn. have been variously estimated. Harnack, as we have seen, leaves it an open question as to whether the Fourth Evangelist had read the Lukan writings. Moffatt thinks that the solution of the problem lies in a combination of two hypotheses. On the one hand, the two Gospels go back independently to common traditions or sources; on the other hand, the two simply represent in one aspect the climax of a development which can be traced from Mk. to Lk. (*I.N.T.*, p. 534 f.). Bacon holds that a large use of Lk. has been made by the Fourth Evangelist, both as to motive and material. 'In its general structure', he writes, 'the outline of the Fourth Gospel . . . reproduces that of Mark *as modified by Luke*.'[1] Stanton's opinion is that while the Fourth Evangelist knew Mk. 'fairly well', it is 'more than doubtful' if he knew either of the other two Synoptic Gospels (*G.H.D.*, iii, p. 220). In the light of such differences of opinion, one is inclined to retreat to Harnack's position and leave the question an open one. Subsequent discussion, however, has been far from barren, and the view for which there is most to be said is that Lk. and Jn. either rest upon common traditions in certain respects or are independent witnesses to a common process of development.

So much we may say of the relation between Lk. and Jn. Once, however, Proto-Luke is distinguished as an entity from the Third Gospel, a sharper conclusion is necessary. The second of the alternatives noted above is in this case weakened, if it does not entirely fall to the ground. For if Proto-Luke belongs to the sixties, we can hardly with justice explain the elements which it shares with Jn. as the fruit of a process of development. Rather must we boldly accept the view that Proto-Luke and Jn. independently reflect common traditions; it is not likely that they rest upon common sources. We must conclude that Proto-Luke is an independent witness to the fact that the Fourth Gospel contains certain elements which are as early as, and in some cases earlier than, Mk. itself.

This conclusion will need to be qualified, but not dismissed if

[1] Cf. *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 368. The italics are his.

Bacon, and more recently Streeter,[1] are right in thinking that the Fourth Evangelist knew Lk.[2] For, in any case, some of the parallels are not due to such knowledge. Cases in point are the greater interest of Proto-Luke and Jn., as compared with Mk., in the Jerusalem Ministry, their agreement as to the date of the Supper, and probably their common neglect of the story of the Cleansing in the development of the Passion story. For in Lk. these features are almost invisible; it is *only when we disinter Proto-Luke* that they are clearly discernible. To this extent, then, Proto-Luke and Jn. are independent witnesses, even if the Fourth Evangelist was acquainted with Lk. Again, in other matters the same conclusion is natural. The references of Jn. to Annas do not depend on Lk. iii. 3, nor are the Johannine parallels to some of the details of the Cure of the Centurion's Servant, or even the Anointing, necessarily the result of borrowing. If Lk. and Jn. agree in speaking of Martha and Mary, and in relating Samaritan incidents, the stories given are quite different. The same is true of the conversations after the Supper and, with the possible exception of Lk. xxiv. 36–43 and Jn. xx. 19–23, of the Resurrection narratives. So far as dependence is concerned, the Lukan saying, 'I am in the midst of you as he that serveth' (xxii. 27), is better explained as an echo of the tradition of the Feet Washing (Jn. xiii. 1 ff.) than vice versa, while the agreements of Lk. and Jn. in relating Appearances of the Risen Christ at Jerusalem, and in emphasizing the corporeal aspect of the Resurrection, are adequately described as inde-

[1] Cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 401 ff.

[2] At its best, the case for supposing that Lk. was known to St. John is not a strong one, the apparent cross-references between Jn. xi. 1 f., xii. 2, and the Lukan story of Martha and Mary (x. 38 ff.) being the most important of a number of debatable points. Streeter argues that in Jn. xi. 1 ('of Bethany, of the village of Mary and her sister Martha') St. John appears to identify the unnamed village of Lk. x. 38 ('a certain village'), and that other cross-references to the Lukan story occur in Jn. xii. 2 ('and Martha served'), and in Jn. xi. 2, where Mary of Bethany is said to be the unnamed woman who, according to Mk., anointed Jesus at that place. The agreements which are thought to imply dependence include the statement that the woman anointed the feet of Jesus and wiped them with her hair, the explanation of the treachery of Judas by the theory of Satanic suggestion, the reference to the Denial during the Supper, Pilate's threefold vindication of Jesus, the reference to the servant's 'right' ear, the description of the tomb as one 'wherein was never man yet laid', and the statement that two angels were seen at the tomb. Cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 402, 404. Other subsidiary points are detailed on pp. 405 ff.

pendent reflections of the same tradition. Thus, even if it is right to presume the Fourth Evangelist's knowledge of Lk.,[1] it still remains true that in many particulars Proto-Luke and Jn. independently agree.

The conclusion stated above is one of first importance. It will not serve to rehabilitate extreme views which regard the Fourth Gospel as the actual work of an Apostolic eyewitness. The real significance of the conclusion, indeed, is broader than the question of authorship. The agreement between Proto-Luke and Jn. supports the contention that in important respects the Fourth Gospel rests upon the testimony of one who saw and heard; that, however far reflection and experience have carried the Evangelist in his portraiture of Christ, the process does not begin in the air. It is no figment of the imagination, but takes its rise from solid fact. To take this view does not mean that every feature common to Proto-Luke and Jn. is thereby authenticated as historical, and as worthy to be preferred whenever there is a conflict with Mk. The problem is by no means so simple as that. As a working hypothesis, it is undeniable that preference must be given to earlier tradition; but, obviously, such a principle must be qualified by others. The fullest consideration has to be given to the character of a tradition as well as to its date; to the influence of governing ideas upon the minds of those who record it; to the accidents of transmission; and, what is most difficult of all, to questions of general probability. Because these principles have sometimes been recklessly applied, it is foolish to ignore them, for it is by a combination of caution and boldness that progress in historical criticism alone is possible.

It is impossible here to discuss in much detail the application of the principles which have just been mentioned. We shall certainly be justified, on the joint testimony of Proto-Luke and Jn., in finding a place in the story of Jesus for Annas; for Martha and Mary; for the view that the preaching of the Baptist awakened Messianic expectations; for the opinion that during the night before the death of Jesus deeper and more intimate teaching was imparted by Him to His disciples than Mk. would lead us to suppose; and for the belief that, whatever

[1] The alternative view, that what the Fourth Evangelist knew was not Lk. but Proto-Luke, is less probable still. Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

happened in Galilee, Appearances of the Risen Christ were seen at Jerusalem. More important still is the added weight that is given to the truth of the Johannine date for the Supper, and in consequence for the view that Jesus died shortly before the Passover actually began. The question of the Cleansing of the Temple is more difficult and will be reserved for discussion in the next section. The place of the Post-Resurrection Appearances of Jesus must also be deferred until we examine the differences between Proto-Luke and Mk. Reference, however, to the nature of the *Resurrection Body of Jesus* may be made now. There can be no doubt that in Proto-Luke and in Jn. a physical Resurrection of Jesus is taught. In the former the presence of Jesus is tacitly distinguished from that of a spirit (Lk. xxiv. 37),[1] while the Risen Christ expressly says: 'See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having' (Lk. xxiv. 39).[2] In Jn. Thomas is invited to touch the print of the nails and to thrust his hand into the wounded side (Jn. xx. 27). How far this representation of the Body of the Risen Christ is true to fact is a disputed question which cannot, and need not, be discussed here. Our concern must rather be with the bearing of the alternative views on the truth of the Proto-Luke Theory. If the Resurrection was physical in the sense described, there is, of course, no problem for us at all. But even if we must dissent from the view that the Risen Body was one of flesh and bones, we have not in this fact any valid reason to dispute the early date and historical worth of Proto-Luke. The emphasis on the corporeal aspect of the Resurrection Body of Jesus is not the kind of corruption to be expected only after the lapse of half a century. Even if it is a corruption, it is one which, in view of current Jewish beliefs,[3] might have arisen at a very early date. Proto-Luke is not a work which records testimony at first hand, and presuppositions regarding the Resurrection are not unlikely to have influenced details in the

[1] 'But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit.'

[2] Cf. also Lk. xxiv. 42 f.: 'And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. And he took it, and did eat before them.'

[3] Cf. Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 24 ff.

traditions of good eyewitnesses. Thus, if modern criticism places such passages as Lk. xxiv. 37, 39, 42 f. on a lower level of historical trustworthiness, the opinion is not one which affects the work as a whole, or even touches the question of its date.[1] The scantiness of our data makes the discussion of the allied question of *The Ascension* more difficult. If we omit the words 'and was carried up into heaven' in Lk. xxiv. 51, it is not certain that Lk. xxiv. 50–3 was originally intended to describe more than the parting of Jesus from His disciples.[2] The terms of Lk. xxiv. 52, which describe the disciples returning to Jerusalem with great joy, appear, however, to imply a final parting. In this case Proto-Luke knows nothing of an Ascension, and the tradition of a forty days' interval during which the Risen Christ spoke to His disciples of things 'concerning the kingdom of God' (Acts i. 3) is a later belief of doubtful value upon which St. Luke lighted subsequent to the composition, not only of Proto-Luke, but also of the Third Gospel itself.

The most important agreement between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel is that which relates to the date of *The Last Supper*.[3] The divergence between Jn. and the Synoptic Gospels upon this point is patent. Attempts to harmonize the two accounts do not yield satisfaction, and the strong tendency of recent research is to give the preference to the Johannine date.[4] Schmiedel's contention[5] that the day of Jesus' death is artificially fixed in Jn. is not satisfactory, if only from the lack of any indication in the Fourth Gospel of the identification of the fate of Jesus with the offering of the Paschal Lamb,[6] while within the Synoptics themselves there are traces of an older view corresponding to that implied in Jn.[7] The Proto-Luke Hypothesis

[1] Cf. Harnack, *The Date of Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 157 ff.

[2] Cf. Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 106 f. Westcott and Hort explain Lk. xxiv. 51 as a 'Western non-interpolation'. But cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 142 f., 408.

[3] Cf. Jn. xiii. 1, 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14, 31. The date of the Supper in Proto-Luke is discussed on pp. 37, 39.

[4] Cf. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 150 ff.; Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 544 f.; Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, pp. 415 ff.; Stanton, *G.H.D.*, iii, pp. 247 ff.

[5] Cf. *The Johannine Writings*, pp. 126 ff.

[6] Cf. Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

[7] Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 153 f.; Moffatt, who refers expressly to Lk. xxii. 15–16 (*op. cit.*, p. 545); Stanton—see especially his treatment of Chwolson's theory (*op. cit.*, pp. 250 ff.). Stanton, however, reminds us that we must

undoubtedly has its contribution to make to this problem. Once we recognize that Lk. xxii. 1–13 is a Markan addition to St. Luke's earlier account of the Supper, the features within Lk. xxii. 14–18 which bespeak a date previous to the Passover Meal become irresistible, and the agreement between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel increases the credibility of the Johannine date by carrying back the tradition at least as early as the sixties.

It remains for us to consider the Johannine parallels to some of the details of such narratives as the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (Lk. v. 1–11), the Cure of the Centurion's Servant (Lk. vii. 2–10), and the Woman in the City (Lk. vii. 36–50). As regards the second and third, the parallels are so slight as to leave no ground for any decided opinion. It is otherwise in the case of *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes*, which shares several distinctive features with the narrative of Jn. xxi. 1–17. For our special purpose, however, the parallelism is of less importance in view of the growing tendency to regard the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel (xxi.) as a subsequent addition by another hand.[1] It is not likely that the two narratives record separate incidents; the similarities between them are probably too close to be ignored. Each is connected with Simon Peter and with the Sea of Galilee; in each case there is a reference to fruitless night toil on the part of the disciples and to a miraculous sequel at the word of Jesus; and, most of all, in each story Peter receives a commission. The differences between the two stories do not preclude the literary connexion between them, for to a considerable extent we can see how the differences have arisen. Behind Jn. xxi. 1–17 lie the story of the Denial and the primitive belief that an Appearance of Jesus had been vouchsafed to Peter (1 Cor. xv. 5; Mk. xvi. 7; Lk. xxiv. 34). The facts more than warrant the suspicion that the story of Jn. xxi. 1–17 is a literary fusion of disparate elements of which the Lukan narrative is but one. An alternative view posits a confusion in early Christian tradition

beware of exaggerating the seriousness of the infringements of the feast-day rest recorded (*op. cit.*, p. 253).

[1] Cf. Bacon, *op. cit.*, pp. 191 ff.; Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 572; Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff.; see also Schmiedel, *op. cit.*, p. 186 f. Dr. Sanday (*op. cit.*, p. 80 f.) is on the other side, but the tendency of recent research is in the direction indicated, and nowhere more markedly than in Dr. Stanton's volume (1920).

by which the story of Lk. v. 1–11 has been transformed into a Post-Resurrection narrative. In either case, the priority of the Lukan story is implied, but in view of the late date and doubtful value of the Johannine Appendix little more can be said.

The full results of the agreements between Proto-Luke and Jn. are not before us in the above summary, for the treatment of the story of the Cleansing of the Temple and of the tradition relating to the place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus has been deferred. In these matters, Proto-Luke and Jn. either are or appear to be in conflict with St. Mark's Gospel. Reasons will be given for preferring the non-Markan alternative in these cases.[1] If this view can be sustained, the agreement of Proto-Luke and Jn. in these questions, not to speak of the date of the Supper and other matters mentioned above, has implications which tell in each of two directions. On the one hand, certain aspects of the witness of Proto-Luke are confirmed by a later Gospel; on the other hand, the Fourth Gospel is shown to rest in important matters upon traditions the existence of which we can trace at least a quarter of a century earlier.

§ 3. *Points of Difference between Proto-Luke and St. Mark's Gospel.*

When we compare Proto-Luke and St. Mark's Gospel, the fact which strikes us most is the comparatively small amount of matter, outside the Passion narrative, which they have in common. In part, this is due to the complete difference of plan upon which each is constructed. The backbone of Proto-Luke is Q, into which additions, drawn from a limited cycle of tradition, have been inserted. St. Mark incorporates richer and more varied material, mainly of a narrative type, in such a way as to produce a vivid picture of the Mission and Ministry of Jesus. It may be that originally Proto-Luke was a more considerable document than we imagine. Without being able definitely to assign to it the narratives of the Transfiguration, the Cure of the Epileptic Lad, and the Second Prediction of the Passion, we found reason to think that St. Luke had other sources for these stories besides

[1] See pp. 237 f., 242 ff.

Mk.[1] Thus, their presence in Proto-Luke is at least a possibility. The independence of Proto-Luke and Mk. is not, however, an insuperable difficulty, even in respect of subject-matter. In Mk. itself there are serious gaps, as, for example, Mk. vii. 31 and Mk. x. 1.[2] For all its apparent fullness, the Second Gospel is a selection, and not a standard version to which other attempts to tell the Gospel story must rigorously comply.

Interesting as are the points in which Proto-Luke and Mk. agree, those in which they appear to differ are more striking still. It is by no means always possible to explain the divergences, or even to be sure that they are ultimately to be reckoned as such. Nor, when the differences are felt to be real, can the preference always be given to Proto-Luke. In the main, however, the contrary is true, and this claim, if it can be justified, supports the hypothesis which has been unfolded.

A small but not unimportant difference at the outset appears in the reason given for *The Departure to Galilee.* In Mk., followed with emphasis by Mt., the Departure is brought into close connexion with the imprisonment of John. It is after the Baptist is 'delivered up' that Jesus comes into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God (Mk. i. 14, cf. Mt. iv. 12). Proto-Luke tells us nothing of this. On the contrary, the Departure of Jesus is closely associated with the experience of the Temptation; it is 'in the power of the Spirit' that Jesus sets out for Galilee (Lk. iv. 14). The difference is not one to be pressed; it is a feature pointing rather to the independence of the two representations. At the same time, one feels that Proto-Luke has stressed the more important point.

After what has been previously said regarding the Sermon at Nazareth (see p. 148), we need not pause to discuss this incident farther. It is the neglect of Lk. iv. 15, with its reference to a period of successful synagogue preaching, which explains the frequent objection that St. Luke has introduced this incident too early in his narrative. St. Luke is not attempting to give a chronological account of the Galilean Ministry; he lacked the material to do this. It is rather the intrinsic interest of the story which accounts both for its place and the full treatment which is

[1] See pp. 89 ff.

[2] Cf. Burkitt, *G.H.T.*, pp. 96 f.

given to it. The incident brings into the foreground an estimate of Jesus and of the character of His Mission which are characteristic of Proto-Luke and of its author's mind. The story of *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (Lk. v. 1–11) was treated in the last section, but its main interest is clearly the difference which exists between it and the story of the Call of the First Disciples in Mk. i. 16–20. It is a very unsatisfactory type of exposition which explains these narratives as the accounts of separate incidents; they have too much in common[1] and neither follows naturally after the other. The differences, however, preclude any literary connexion between the two.[2] In the mind of St. Mark the whole incident takes place on the seashore, whereas in the Lukan story the entering into the boat is an essential part of the story. Jesus enters the boat because of the thronging multitudes, and sitting there He addresses them (Lk. v. 3). The very similar statement which occurs in Mk. iv. 1, and which forms an introduction to the Parable of the Sower, raises the question whether St. Mark has separated this detail from the story of the Call or whether St. Luke has conjoined them. We can ask this question, but we have not the material for a definite answer. So far from being a mere appendage to the Lukan story, the reference to the entering of Jesus into the boat determines its form. The putting forth into the deep, the letting down of the nets, the unexpected catch of fishes, the cry of Simon, and the call to discipleship follow on naturally from the introductory statement. Thus, in the mind of the two writers the two stories are separately conceived. This does not mean that we have to choose one to the exclusion of the other. It is the miraculous element in the Lukan story which tempts us to do this, but a miracle is not necessarily involved,[3] though this is the suggestion of the narrative,[4] nor have we any need to postulate a long interval for the growth of legendary accretion.

[1] Each is a story of the call of the fishermen, Peter, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee. Both agree that Jesus addressed a remark about catching men, though they report it differently, and that the men followed Jesus.

[2] Mk. does not mention the fact that Jesus entered one of the boats. He tells us nothing of the draught of fishes, nor of the cry of Simon: 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.'

[3] Cf. Bruce, *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, p. 230.

[4] Cf. Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 230f.

We cannot dismiss the Lukan narrative as a legendary version of what is told in Mk. i. 16–20. The narrative reflects a separate and independent cycle of tradition, and, without any design on the Evangelist's part, supplies a real lack in the Markan story. For, however high the historical value of the Markan narrative may be—and in this respect it needs no defence—the story probably suffers from compression; it is not quite apparent, unless we bring in the narrative of Jn. i. 35–42, why the disciples should have responded to a bare word of invitation. The story of Lk. v. 1–11 does not suffer from this objection; on the contrary, the association of the Call with the interest of Jesus in the occupation of Simon, His teaching, the wonder of the catch, and the self-abasement of the future disciple, is psychologically convincing; we see at once why Simon and the rest 'left all and followed him'.

The differences between the Lukan and Markan versions of the account of the Appointment of the Twelve suggest independence but not conflict. In the case, however, of the story of *The Woman in the City*, we have probably an instance of conflicting evidence, in which the verdict seems to go against Proto-Luke. The problem arises from the comparison of this narrative (Lk. vii. 36–50) with the Markan story of the Anointing (Mk. xiv. 3–9). There is, of course, no problem at all if these narratives refer to distinct events, but so easy a solution is scarcely open to us. There is certainly material to support this supposition,[1] but the balance of probability favours the view that the same incident lies behind both Lk. and Mk.[2] If this opinion is sound, preference should doubtless be given to the Markan narrative so far as the occasion is concerned. St. Luke's story is introduced without any temporal statement, and its close conjunction with the reference to Jesus the 'friend of publicans and sinners', who came 'eating and drinking', points to a topical rather than a chronological arrangement. Moreover, the evident signs of a

[1] The woman, e. g., is a sinner, and the host a Pharisee (cf. Mk. xiv. 3). There is no reference to the indignation of the guests (cf. Mk. xiv. 4), while the dialogue with Simon is peculiar to the Lukan story. Cf. also the reference in Lk. to the feet (vii. 38, 46) and in Mk. to the head (xiv. 3).

[2] Note the common references to the meal, the 'alabaster cruse of ointment', and the agreement with Jn. xii. 3 regarding the hair. In each story Jesus has to defend the woman's action.

dramatic treatment to which St. Luke has subjected the story appear to imply the art of a teacher who has been attracted to the story for its own intrinsic interest and meaning. The presumption is that the Evangelist is without information as to its exact place in the career of Jesus. These criticisms in no way detract from the beauty and significance of the Lukan story. It enshrines a true and a precious memory of the spirit and mind of Jesus in the circles in which St. Luke moved. Nor need we doubt that some of its details preserve genuine recollections about which St. Mark is silent. So far from suggesting a later date, the peculiar character of the Lukan story supports the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Mk. xiv. 3–9 would have supplied the chronological information of which St. Luke was apparently in want at the time when he first wrote the story of Lk. vii. 36–50.

We have now covered the principal differences between Proto-Luke and Mk. in the incidents connected with the Galilean Mission. In our inquiry nothing has emerged which is inconsistent with the implications of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. The knowledge which St. Luke had of the Ministry in Galilee is obviously limited, but, in the large extracts which he subsequently drew from Mk. in compiling the Third Gospel, this deficiency is his own confession. The truth is that for this period Mk. is and must be our chief guide; an estimate of Proto-Luke which does not recognize this fact will only serve to bring the hypothesis into disrepute. At the same time, within the limitations mentioned, Proto-Luke is valuable as an independent witness even in relation to this period, for if the Galilean tradition to which St. Luke had access is circumscribed in extent, it is good in quality. It must be remembered that in expressing this opinion we have regard, not only to the differences discussed in the present section, but also to the agreements set out in Section 1.

Leaving the Galilean period, we must now consider the long account of *The Journey from Galilee to Jerusalem* which is given in Lk. ix. 51–xviii. 14, xix. 1–28. The difference between Mk. and Proto-Luke in respect of this journey is patent, but it may easily be overpressed. It is not improbable that the long Lukan section contains material which properly belongs to the

Galilean Ministry.[1] If so, we have yet another illustration of the gaps in St. Luke's information relating to this period. This admission, however, does not touch the strong probability that for information connected with the journey St. Luke had access to good tradition. There is very much to be said for Dr. Bartlet's suggestion[2] that the early part of the 'Greater Interpolation' rests upon the tradition of one who was in close touch with the Seventy. Such an opinion explains the well-knit character of the passage Lk. ix. 51–x. 24, which forms such a contrast to the many loosely connected passages which follow. The section tells of the determination of Jesus to undertake the fateful journey, of the messengers sent before His face, of the appointment of the Seventy, and of the Charge given to them, of their return, and of the rejoicing of Jesus. It may well be the information which lies behind this section which suggested to St. Luke the method of using Q which is adopted in the sections which follow. The idea of a journey is sometimes almost lost, but it remains the thread on which the story hangs. It is, however, important to recognize that St. Luke's procedure is no mere literary device. Apart from the implications of Lk. ix. 51–x. 24, St. Mark's Gospel itself indicates that the last journey to Jerusalem was longer and richer in incident than might at first be supposed. If the Markan story of this journey occupies little more than a chapter of fifty-two verses, how much more is implied in the opening words: 'And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judaea and beyond Jordan: and multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again' (Mk. x. 1)?[3] In the light of this passage, we are entitled to say that the difference between Mk. and Proto-Luke in respect of this journey is not to the discredit of the latter; on the contrary, in supplying us with information about a period of which Mk. has little to

[1] 'That St. Luke has inserted a quantity of extraneous matter into his story which belongs to other times and places can hardly be doubted: this is certainly the case with the sayings about Beelzebub (Lk. xi. 15 ff.), and it is hardly likely that Jesus would be taking a meal with Pharisees (xi. 37, xiv. 1), ... in the midst of the Samaritan country. But it is quite possible that the Samaritan journey itself was found by St. Luke in a previously existing source; at least the story of the Samaritan village ... sounds historical enough' (Burkitt, *G.H.T.*, p. 97).

[2] See p. 14.

[3] Cf. Burkitt's valuable note on this verse, and the conjecture by which he seeks to harmonize the accounts in Mk. and Lk. (*G.H.T.*, p. 96 f.).

tell, Proto-Luke is to be trusted as an historical authority.[1] The authority is not that of an eyewitness, but it is that of a writer who had access to good, if incomplete, tradition.[2]

We now come to the period of *The Passion and the Resurrection* and of the events leading up thereto. It is here that the differences between the Markan and Lukan narratives are most striking, and at the same time it is here that the historical value of Proto-Luke is most apparent. In order to show this, we shall take the several narratives in succession. It is, of course, the divergences which we have specially in mind; some of these are more interesting than important, and in other cases the reverse is true, but all will be found to bear on the question of the historical worth of Proto-Luke.

The first question to be considered is the difference between Proto-Luke and Mk. regarding *The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem.* In Proto-Luke this incident is more accurately described as the Approach to Jerusalem, or the Exultant Cry of the Disciples as the City came in Sight. There is even reason to ask if the Lukan story does not record an early tradition out of which the Markan narrative grew. Certainly the Lukan incident is simpler and intrinsically the more convincing. Our confidence in this opinion is strengthened by the fact that, while in the Third Gospel St. Luke attempts to combine his earlier story with that in Mk., he does so but haltingly; he takes over the story of the Colt,[3] but still has no reference to the entering into the city (cf. Mk. xi. 11).[4] Even in Mk. it is to be observed that very little is made of the Entry itself. A single verse indicates that Jesus entered the Temple, and that having looked

[1] 'The thoroughness of Lk.'s investigation is once more shown by his giving us eight or nine long chapters of material which is given by no one else; while his honesty is conspicuous in the fact of his not attempting a precision which he did not find in his sources' (Plummer, *I.C.C., St. Lk.*, p. 261).

[2] 'Probably Luke the Gentile had only vague ideas about the topography in these eastern parts of Palestine. But plainly he believed that there was a considerable interval between the time when Jesus left Galilee and His coming to Jerusalem for the last Passover, and that it was spent in the region to the south of Galilee and east of Jerusalem' (Stanton, *G.H.D.*, iii. 243).

[3] See the earlier discussion of this question on p. 94. The place of the Lukan story in the order of St. Luke's non-Markan source is treated on p. 97.

[4] 'And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple; and when he had looked round about upon all things, it being now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.'

round about upon all things He departed with the Twelve to Bethany (xi. 11). Thus, the Markan narrative itself is that of a triumphal approach more than that of a triumphal entry.[1] This want is supplied in St. Matthew's Gospel ('And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was stirred, saying, Who is this? And the multitudes said, This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee', xxi. 10 f.), where the last creative touch is given to the picture. More than any other version, it is the Matthaean story which is responsible for the traditional picture of the Triumphal Entry, and between this picture and the narrative of Proto-Luke the divergence is radical. As we have seen, the difference between Mk. and Proto-Luke is less great, though still striking. St. Mark's story of the Obtaining of the Colt may well rest on genuine tradition, but it is from Proto-Luke that we gain the surest understanding of what really took place.[2]

The conclusion to be adopted in respect of *The Cleansing of the Temple* is less certain, for here we are dealing with a case of silence.[3] In a work so obviously incomplete as Proto-Luke, the writer's silence regarding the Cleansing would tell us nothing, were it not for the curious way in which St. Luke inserted this narrative when compiling his Gospel. In the Third Gospel the Cleansing follows with the greatest abruptness after the reference to the Weeping. As, moreover, in Lk. it has no antecedent in a story of triumphal entry, so it has no consequent in the anger of the hierarchy;[4] it arises out of nothing and it effects nothing. It is only because we already know St. Mark's Gospel that we do not at once perceive the entire irrelevance of the Cleansing to

[1] Even the Johannine narrative is rather the story of a triumphal greeting (cf. Jn. xii. 12–19).

[2] The objection to the historical character of the reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in Lk. xix. 41–4 is considered on p. 123.

[3] See p. 95 f., where the conclusion is drawn that the story of the Cleansing in Lk. xxii. 45 f. is a Markan insertion in the Third Gospel.

[4] In Proto-Luke the hostility of the priests is occasioned, not by the Cleansing of the Temple, but by the daily teaching of Jesus in Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 47 f.). See the earlier discussion of this point on p. 96 f. In itself this representation is much the more probable, for, even in Mk., no further reference to the Cleansing is made in the subsequent development of the Passion story. Jesus is condemned, not on the ground of His actions, but because of His claims ('Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?', Mk. xiv. 61, cf. Lk. xxii. 67). The Lukan story is thus more consistent with itself than the Markan narrative.

the Lukan story. Apparently, in the Third Gospel, the Evangelist accepts the narrative on the sole authority of St. Mark, but plainly he does not know what to do with it. It is for this reason that we can claim a parallel between the silence of Proto-Luke and the phenomena in Jn. The Markan tradition regarding the Cleansing is probably due to the fact that St. Mark knows of but one visit to Jerusalem. On its merits, the earlier Johannine date for this incident is preferable,[1] but the additional evidence afforded by the silence of Proto-Luke and by the Third Gospel itself is decisive.

Turning to the events on the night before the Crucifixion, we have first to compare the account of *The Supper* given in Proto-Luke with St. Mark's narrative.[2] We have already found reason to think that there is a divergence between the two as regards the date, and that in this matter Proto-Luke, which agrees with Jn., is to be preferred (see p. 229). The identification of the Supper with the Passover Meal must probably be set down, so far as we can explain it at all, to the influence of ecclesiastical usage in the circles (probably Roman) in which the Second Gospel was compiled.[3] The slight treatment accorded to the Supper in Proto-Luke is remarkable in view of the fuller account which this document supplies of the intercourse of Jesus with His disciples during the evening, another feature which, as we have seen, it shares with the Fourth Gospel. A comparison of Lk. xxii. 14–18 with Mk. xiv. 17, 22–5 leaves little room for doubt that the Lukan story is the earlier and the more primitive. This conclusion, however, does not compel us to treat the two as alternatives, so that in accepting the one we must necessarily reject the other. No one can read the account given in Proto-Luke and regard it as complete; it is brief, allusive, enigmatic. No reference is made to the distribution of bread, and even as regards the Cup, no saying is recorded by which its contents are directly associated with the Blood of Christ. At the same time, we cannot read the Lukan story without realizing that it describes

[1] Cf. Stanton, *G.H.D.*, iii, p. 234 f.; Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 149 f. On the other side, cf. Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 538; Bacon, *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 395.

[2] On the critical side, full consideration is given to this question on pp. 37, 39.

[3] Cf. Bacon, *op. cit.*, pp. 260, 412, 426.

an act of fellowship which is implicitly associated with the death of Jesus.[1] 'Take this,' says Jesus, 'and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come' (xxii. 17b–18). It is because Jesus is about to die that the Cup is passed round, and even though the actual words, 'This is my Blood', are wanting in Proto-Luke, the Cup is none the less a cup of fellowship in view of the death of Jesus. Thus, the narrative is not an alternative account of the Supper; it is an imperfect account, a first draft. St. Luke has confessed as much in his insertion of the Markan passage[2] which appears in the Third Gospel: 'And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body' (Lk. xxii. 19a, cf. Mk. xiv. 22). A depreciation of Mk. xiv. 17, 22–5 in consequence of Lk. xxii. 14–18 would therefore be precarious. The Markan narrative of institution is supported by the account of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 23–5. The question arises how it is that St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, can be credited with such an account of the Supper as we find in Lk. xxii. 14–18, and why, when he does eventually expand his narrative in the Third Gospel, his debt is to St. Mark (Lk. xxii. 19a, cf. Mk. xiv. 22) and not to St. Paul.[3] Not without justice, we might take refuge in ignorance. There is still need, however, to insist that St. Luke is not a Paulinist,[4] and that his knowledge of the Pauline Churches must in the sixties have been marked by considerable gaps. He meets St. Paul at Troas and accompanies him to Philippi, and later he journeys with the Apostle from Philippi by sea to Syria, and thence by land to Jerusalem. Later still he voyages with St. Paul from Caesarea to Rome. But how much does he know of the inner life of the Pauline Churches? What does he know of Corinth? Imagination, playing upon such passages as Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24, and 2 Tim. iv. 11, and upon the tradition which connects St. Luke with Antioch, is largely responsible for the uncritical assumption that he must have possessed intimate knowledge of Pauline teaching and tradition. The assumption

[1] See also p. 38. [2] See p. 37.

[3] It is from St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 24f. that the 'Western non-interpolation' in Lk. xxii. 19b–20 is derived. See p. 36 n.

[4] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, vol. ii, pp. 295, 390. See also Moffatt, *I.N.T.*, p. 302.

needs serious qualification. The restricted character of Proto-Luke points to a time when St. Luke's knowledge of the story of Jesus was dependent upon good but circumscribed cycles of tradition. With such a situation the account given of the Supper is thoroughly congruous. In respect of its date, the evidence of Proto-Luke is of great value, for here it is supported by phenomena within the Synoptics and by the witness of the Fourth Gospel; but as supplying a narrative of institution, the account of Proto-Luke is wanting. The proof of this is St. Luke's later treatment of his original sketch and the evidence supplied by St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23–5). Other features peculiar to Proto-Luke's account of the Supper are of less importance, but as regards the positions assigned to the prophecy of the Betrayal[1] and the prediction of Peter's fall,[2] there is no reason in either case to prefer the order of Mk.

The next narrative which concerns us is the story of *The Betrayal and Arrest*.[3] Proto-Luke, while aware of the purpose of Judas, does not say that the traitor actually kissed Jesus (cf. Mk. xiv. 45). It is doubtful, however, if this difference can be pressed. There is stronger reason to think that Proto-Luke differed from Mk. in stating that the high priest's servant's ear was struck rather than severed, and this, in view of St. Luke's assertion (peculiar to his Gospel) that Jesus healed the man, is probably the more accurate account of what took place.[4] The differences between Proto-Luke and Mk. as regards *The Mocking*[5] and *The Trial before the Priests*[6] are best taken together. Both authorities place the Mocking on the same evening as the Arrest, but, while Mk. associates it with the Trial, Proto-Luke separates the two and defers the Trial until the following morning. It may be that a preliminary examination took place on the night of the Arrest, but probably Proto-Luke is to be preferred to Mk.

[1] In Proto-Luke *after* the Supper, in Mk. *before*.

[2] In Proto-Luke *after* the Supper but *before the departure*, in Mk. *on the way to the garden*.

[3] There is no need here to consider again the story of what took place in the garden. The differences show that Proto-Luke and Mk. are independent, but their statements are not actually in conflict. The story of the Angel is peculiar to Lk., but whether it is a later insertion in the Gospel is a disputed question. See p. 43 f.

[4] Lk. xxii. 51. See the discussion of this question on p. 46.

[5] See p. 49 f.

[6] See p. 50 f.

in referring the Trial before the Priests to the morning. Even St. Mark has a brief reference to a second Trial in the morning (xv. 1), when the decision to deliver Jesus up to Pilate is taken. Perhaps neither document gives the whole story, but Mk., by placing the detailed account of the Trial during the night of the Arrest, is the more misleading.[1] As regards *The Mocking*, Proto-Luke is more convincing in placing this incident during the interval before the Trial, and in identifying those who maltreated Jesus with the men who had effected the arrest. It may be that Jesus was treated with indignity more than once before the Crucifixion, but a comparison of Lk. xxii. 63–5 with Mk. xiv. 65 will show that the two Evangelists have the same incident in mind.

In the stories of *The Trial before Pilate* and *The Crucifixion* Proto-Luke and Mk. follow independent lines. The chief differences are the features peculiar to the Lukan narrative—the Trial before Herod, the story of the Women who bewailed Jesus on His way to the Cross, and the story of the Penitent Thief. These stories do not conflict with anything that is told in Mk., with the exception that in Mk. xv. 32 both robbers are said to have reproached Jesus. St. Luke's description of the attitude of Pilate is not adequately accounted for by his desire to represent Roman officials in the most favourable light. While he emphasizes the fact that Pilate desired to save Jesus (xxiii. 20), he does not disguise the fact that the governor's judgement was finally overborne by popular clamour (xxiii. 23). His statement, 'And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done' (xxiii. 24), is not flattering. In the account of *The Crucifixion* there are differences regarding the various speakers who address Jesus, but these are of minor importance and cannot be pressed. The most interesting difference is the silence of Proto-Luke about *The Miraculous Darkness* and *The Rending of the Temple Veil*. The fact that St. Luke has afterwards added these incidents[2] on the sole[3] authority of Mk. suggests that, at the time when Proto-Luke was composed, he knew nothing of them. Must we, then,

[1] 'We can hardly suppose that the Jewish grandees kept vigil all night on account of the Galilean Agitator; according to St. Luke they did not do so' (Burkitt, *G.H.T.*, p. 137).

[2] See the discussion of this question on p. 57 f.

[3] This is suggested by the almost verbatim account of these incidents which St. Luke has taken from Mk.

draw the further conclusion and say that they rest on no good historical foundation? The question is complicated by the fact that Proto-Luke is also silent about the story of Peter's Denial[1] and the account of the Burial of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathaea.[2] It must be frankly conceded that the case is one where an opinion can be given only by resorting to considerations of probability. At the same time, the case is just one of those where intrinsic probability has a right to speak. In the stories of the Denial and of the Burial there is nothing that is improbable; each incident bears the witness of truth upon its face. Proto-Luke, moreover, anticipates the Denial in the prophecy of xxii. 31–2. As regards the Darkness and the Rending, the position is otherwise. It is strange that Mk. should be our only authority for facts which, if historical, might be expected to be matters of common knowledge. The silence of Proto-Luke does not suggest that these details are deliberate inventions, but that they are examples of naïve popular tradition of restricted provenance and late date. They take their rise in facts which we can only surmise, facts upon which reflection and imagination have played their part. This view is not mere subjective criticism. Its ground is the character of the incidents in question, the silence of Proto-Luke, and the fact that St. Luke has no other knowledge of them save what he finds in Mk. A similar conclusion in relation to *The Burial* by Joseph would be precarious indeed. Here, St. Luke's silence in Proto-Luke is due, not only to want of knowledge, but also to the fact that he is preoccupied with the action of the women, who followed the body of Jesus to its last resting-place and returned to prepare spices. The superiority of St. Luke's account of the action of the women has previously been argued when his independence of Mk. in this part of his narrative was discussed (see pp. 60 ff.).

The only matters remaining for consideration in the present section are the account of *The Visit of the Women to the Tomb* and *The Place of the Resurrection Appearances*. In the earlier treatment of the question, reason was given for asserting the independence of Proto-Luke and Mk. in the accounts which they give of the Visit to the Tomb.[3] Linguistically the two narratives have very little in common, and in subject-matter they are very

[1] See p. 48 f. [2] See p. 59 f. [3] See p. 63 ff.

different indeed. St. Luke's procedure elsewhere gives us no warrant for thinking that he has deliberately changed 'He goeth before you into Galilee' (Mk. xvi. 7) into 'Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee' (Lk. xxiv. 6). None the less, the difference is there, and if we do not regard the Lukan saying as a conscious modification of Mk. xvi. 7, we have either to choose between them or to go behind both. Of these alternatives the latter is to be preferred, because it is possible that Appearances of Jesus occurred both in Galilee and near Jerusalem, and because each version of the message appears to be adapted to its own sequel. That the Markan narrative implies that after His Resurrection Jesus was seen in Galilee is an opinion which has been almost universally held. This view seems required, not only by the terms of Mk. xvi. 7, but also by the promise of Mk. xiv. 28: 'Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee.' But Dr. F. C. Burkitt has recently reminded us that, in view of the loss of the original ending of the Second Gospel, it is 'not quite certain what Mark went on to narrate' (*Christian Beginnings*, p. 87), and that in any case we cannot infer what followed Mk. xvi. 8 from the contents of Mt. xxviii. 9–20 (*op. cit.*, p. 83). Dr. Burkitt's theory is that Peter did set out for Galilee, but did not get very far. 'If he saw his Lord alive again while he was still in the neighbourhood of the city it would not only make him stay, abandoning his projected journey, but he would regard it as a kindly and gracious change of purpose' (*op. cit.*, p. 87).

That there is a pronounced speculative element in this reconstruction Dr. Burkitt would probably be the first to admit, but clearly the possibilities are such as to forbid the very common depreciation of the Lukan tradition in favour of what is too easily assumed to be the Markan. The prevailing tendency has been to sacrifice the Jerusalem tradition of Lk. and Jn. xx. in favour of the Galilean tradition of Mt. and Jn. xxi. This was Professor Lake's position in *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (see pp. 206 ff.), and its most recent statement appears in *The Beginnings of Christianity*: 'There is therefore the strongest probability that Luke has omitted or transformed the story of the disciples in Galilee and their return to Jerusalem. But this is clear only because we possess Mark;

otherwise Luke would have succeeded completely in covering his changes and adaptations' (Pt. I, vol. i, p. 303). Such an opinion would, of course, be fatal to the claim of Proto-Luke to be a competent historical authority, and accordingly we need to inquire how far it is well based. In this matter Dr. Burkitt's argument is the more welcome because it is stated apart altogether from the Proto-Luke Theory, which is nowhere in view in the course of his exposition.

Dr. Burkitt's reason for preferring the Jerusalem tradition is the fact that the earliest centre of Christianity of which we know is not Galilee but Jerusalem. 'As soon as we know anything about the earliest Christians, we find them in Jerusalem and nowhere else' (*op. cit.*, p. 84). There is indeed no evidence for early Galilean Christianity (p. 89).[1] This is entirely contrary to what we should expect[2] if the Lukan tradition has to be sacrificed in favour of the belief that Galilee was the scene of the Appearances. In this case, Galilee would have been the home of the Infant Church; Peter and the rest would have remained in the region where they had first seen the Risen Lord. Thus, the known centre of primitive Christianity supports the tradition of Lk. and Jn. This is a strong argument, and from our own point of view it is supported by all the arguments which have led us so far to trust Proto-Luke as a reliable authority. Dr. Burkitt does not refer to what is perhaps the strongest argument on the other side. This is the improbability that the early Church would have invented the Galilean episode. The argument is stated by the Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* as follows: 'If the disciples did not go to Galilee and there see the risen Jesus, there is no reason why the early Church—which certainly was settled at Jerusalem—should have invented the story; on the other hand, there is every reason why it should soon forget or ignore the short Galilean episode, and transfer to its own locality the experiences of the first witnesses to the risen Jesus' (Pt. I, vol. i, p. 303). What-

[1] '... so far as I know, there never were any Christians established in Galilee till the days when Christians were to be found in every corner of the Empire' (*Christian Beginnings*, p. 84).

[2] Prof. Lake speaks of the fact that the Christian Church from the beginning was the Church of Jerusalem and not of Capernaum as 'one of the missing links in the chain of early history' (*The Evidence for the Resurrection*, p. 210).

ever truth there is in this contention may well be accepted without rejecting the Lukan tradition. There are at least two answers between which it is not necessary for us to decide. On the one hand, the Galilean tradition may have arisen in consequence of the genuine reminiscence of the words of Jesus in Mk. xiv. 28. Reminiscences may have provoked inferences and inferences may have hardened into beliefs. If Dr. Burkitt's theory of an arrested journey of Peter into Galilee can be accepted, such a suggestion receives a sufficient initial basis in fact. On the other hand—and this is probably the better reply—for all that has been said to the contrary, Appearances of Jesus may well have been experienced both in Judaea and in Galilee, and Lk. xxiv. may be a foreshortened [1] account of the experiences of the first witnesses to the Risen Lord. In any case, it is from the more to the less assured positions that a truly scientific investigation must move. Whatever we may make of the Galilean tradition, the Jerusalem tradition stands on solid ground, and we ought to make this our starting-point in investigating a tradition which has the weaker attestation of Mt. xxviii. and Jn. xxi., and the undefined support of the lost ending of Mk. Here we are not called upon to enter into the details of this fascinating inquiry. Our problem is the historical value of Proto-Luke, and, within the limits of its narration, we have no good reason to question its story. Lk. xxiv. may not, and probably does not, tell us all that transpired, but, within the area of its reference, it reflects the witness of those in close touch with the original facts.

We have now reviewed the principal differences, apparent and real, between Proto-Luke and Mk. It would be absurd to suggest that the comparison leads to any wholesale depreciation of Mk. as an historical authority. The position of Mk. in this respect is much too well assured. Moreover, with one or two excep-

[1] Note what Ramsay has to say about St. Luke as deficient in the sense of time (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 17 f.). 'Luke's style is compressed to the highest degree; and he expects a great deal from the reader. He does not attempt to sketch the surroundings and set the whole scene like a picture before the reader; he states the bare facts that seem to him important, and leaves the reader to imagine the situation' (*op. cit.*, p. 17). In the Acts 'he dismisses ten years in a breath, and devotes a chapter to a single incident' (*ibid.*, p. 18).

tions, the inquiry has necessarily centred upon points which are not of fundamental importance. Important for the comparison of one document with another, in no case do they compel us to disregard the authority whose witness on special points we find reason to reject. The real conclusion is the solid worth of Proto-Luke. Deficient in the Galilean period, and somewhat cursory in its treatment of the last journey to Jerusalem, it is a first-rate authority for all that relates to the Passion and Resurrection. Here, indeed, it is everywhere comparable to Mk. as a competent witness, and where the two disagree it is Proto-Luke as a rule which preserves the better tradition.

§ 4. *Narratives peculiar to Proto-Luke.*[1]

Besides the points in which Proto-Luke is in agreement with or in conflict with other authorities, there are narratives which are peculiar to the document, and we require to know what bearing these have upon the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Do they support this theory, or do they raise difficulties which militate against it?

The list of the narratives which are peculiar to Proto-Luke is as follows:

1.	The Sermon at Nazareth.[2]	iv. 16–30.
2.	The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.[3]	v. 1–11.
3.	The Widow's Son at Nain.	vii. 11–17.
4.	The Woman in the City.[4]	vii. 36–50.
5.	The Preaching Tour through Cities and Villages.	viii. 1–3.
6.	The Samaritan Village.	ix. 51–6.
7.	The Mission and Return of the Seventy.	x. 1, 17–20.
8.	Martha and Mary.	x. 38–42.
9.	The Woman who cried, 'Blessed is the womb', &c.	xi. 27–8.
10.	The Cure of the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity.	xiii. 10–17.
11.	Jesus and Herod ('That fox').	xiii. 31–3.
12.	The Cure of the Dropsical Man.	xiv. 1–6.
13.	The Cure of the Ten Lepers.	xvii. 11–19.
14.	Zacchaeus.	xix. 1–10.
15.	Jesus weeping over Jerusalem.	xix. 41–4.

[1] The Genealogy and the Parables peculiar to Proto-Luke will be treated in the course of the following chapter.

[2] Although the narrative refers to the same incident as Mk. vi. 1–6, the story, as St. Luke tells it, is peculiar to his Gospel.

[3] The relation between this narrative and Jn. xxi. 1–17 is a much-disputed question. See p. 229 f.

[4] Much the greater part of this story is peculiar to Lk. Cf. Mk. xiv. 3–9, and see p. 233 f.

16.	The Angel in the Garden, &c.	xxii. 43–4.
17.	The Healing of the High Priest's Servant's Ear.	xxii. 50–1.
18.	The Trial before Herod.	xxiii. 6–12.
19.	The Weeping Women of Jerusalem.	xxiii. 27–32.
20.	The Penitent Thief.	xxiii. 39–43.
21.	The Journey to Emmaus.	xxiv. 13–35.
22.	The Appearance to the Apostles.[1]	xxiv. 36–49.
23.	The Parting of Jesus from His Disciples.	xxiv. 50–3.

The narratives in the above list which have certain features in common with Markan and Johannine narratives have already been treated in some detail. Here we are concerned only with the elements in these stories which are peculiarly Lukan. In no case do we find anything which requires a late date for Proto-Luke. Even in the case of the story of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes we have no need to postulate a considerable interval for the growth of legendary embellishments. The vivid details of the story of *The Sermon at Nazareth* have often been noticed. The references to the unrolling of the roll, the attendant, the rapt attention of the hearers, their anger and attempted violence, point to the testimony of eyewitnesses. The fact that Jesus passed through the midst of the crowd and went His way is probably no miracle, though it may perhaps have been regarded as such. In view of the almost total lack of chronological information in Proto-Luke during the Galilean period, it is futile to object that the hostility of the people anticipates events which followed the 'Galilean Springtime'. Nor is it an adequate objection to the Lukan narrative if we find in it an example of St. Luke's dramatic art, a working up of the rougher material supplied by early Christian tradition. In almost every narrative which he writes, we are compelled to recognize that St. Luke is a great literary artist. This fact is even more manifest in the story of *The Woman in the City* than in the account of the Sermon at Nazareth. The parallelism in the dialogue between Jesus and Simon the Pharisee undoubtedly reveals the Evangelist's hand,[2] yet the story is just one of those narratives which we have most reason to credit to the circles from which the Proto-Luke tradition appears to have been drawn. Like the stories of the Widow's Son at Nain, Martha and Mary, and the Weeping Women of

[1] Possibly this incident is the same as that recorded in Jn. xx. 19–23.

[2] See especially Stanton's examination of the style in this narrative (*G.H.D.*, ii, p. 298).

Jerusalem, it reveals the attitude of Jesus to women, and, like the narratives of Zacchaeus and the Penitent Thief, it displays His treatment of outcasts and sinners. The Evangelist's art is not one which invents stories to embody his characteristic ideas; it is an art which loves to linger over facts which have been reached by inquiry and to clothe them in the most vivid and picturesque language at his command.

In considering the stories which are wholly peculiar to Proto-Luke, it will be best to reserve the miracle-narratives and the Resurrection incidents of Lk. xxiv. for separate treatment, and to review the remaining stories first. These include the following: The Preaching Tour, the Samaritan Village, the Mission and Return of the Seventy, Martha and Mary, the Woman who cried, 'Blessed is the womb', Jesus and Herod, Zacchaeus, Jesus weeping over Jerusalem, the Trial before Herod, the Weeping Women of Jerusalem, and the Penitent Thief. At first sight it is the variety of these stories which strikes the attention, but closer study shows that all of them are incidents which can easily be connected with a single cycle of early Christian tradition. If we think of a body of women who were closely associated with Jesus during His preaching activity, and especially during His last journey to Jerusalem and its tragic sequel, we have a natural explanation for each one of the eleven incidents mentioned. Nor is this suggestion an unsupported inference. The significance of the reference to the women in Lk. viii. 1–3 has often been remarked upon, and especially the reference to Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward.[1] It is from St. Luke alone that we learn of the definite part played by these women, and it cannot be accidental that the narratives under discussion are stories about women, about outcasts and sinners, incidents connected with the journey to Jerusalem, which tell of the dispatch of fore-runners and the reception they received, of the hospitality accorded to Jesus and of His emotion when the city came in sight, and finally incidents which imply special knowledge of

[1] Cf. *O.S.S.*, pp. xiv, 94, 229–31. The reference to Joanna suggests the inference that the story of the Trial before Herod rests upon information supplied by her. Cf. Streeter (*op. cit.*, pp. 229–31), who points out the absence of any apologetic motive in the story of the Trial, and the value of the statement (Lk. xxiii. 12) that the incident led to a reconciliation between Pilate and Herod.

Herod and his court. So far from raising difficulties against the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, it is just such stories as these which are most accordant with the nature of the document and the circumstances of its supposed origin. This opinion should probably be extended so as to cover the account of *The Mission and Return of the Seventy*. Objections have often been raised against the historical character of this incident, but the difficulties are greatly reduced if we regard seventy as a round number, and if we do not allow the ministry of the Twelve to crowd the field of our imagination. It ought rather to be set down to the credit of Proto-Luke as a good historical authority that it so clearly recognizes our Lord's use of a band of mission-preachers in addition to the Twelve. The choice and training of the Twelve are facts so deeply inwrought in the primitive tradition that they may well have tended to dislodge, or at any rate to overshadow, stories relating to other helpers and disciples.[1] It is to Proto-Luke that we owe the reference to the women, and it is really a second merit of this document that it preserves the tradition of the Seventy. We ourselves have observed that it is just in Lk. ix. 51–x. 24 that the story of Proto-Luke (previous to the Passion narrative) is most firmly knitted together in such a way as to suggest that definite information is at the writer's disposal.[2] Certainly there is a marked contrast between this passage and the more loosely constructed sections which follow. No doubt a difficulty arises in the fact that the Charge to the Seventy (x. 2–12) rests upon the same Q source as the Charge which in Mt. x. 5–15 (cf. Mk. vi. 7–11) is addressed to the Twelve. In this matter, however, we may admit St. Luke's editorial use of Q without feeling it necessary to deny the historical character of the story of the Seventy; the two questions are distinct. A Charge must certainly have been given to such heralds of the Kingdom, if St. Luke's account of their Appointment is to be relied upon; and, if so, it must in many respects have closely resembled the Address to the Twelve.[3]

The *miracle-narratives* peculiar to Proto-Luke include the following: The Miraculous Draught of Fishes, the Raising of the Widow's Son, the Cure of the Woman with the Spirit of

[1] Cf. Plummer, *I.C.C.*, *St. Lk.*, p. 271, and Cowan, *D.C.G.*, ii. 618.
[2] See p. 235.
[3] Cf. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

Infirmity, the Cure of the Dropsical Man, the Cure of the Ten Lepers, the Healing of the High Priest's Servant's Ear. With these we may also consider the Lukan story of the Agony, leaving the Resurrection narratives for separate treatment.

With the exception of the first two narratives and the story of the Angel, all the miracles mentioned are miracles of healing.[1] In some respects the most difficult is the case of *The Man with Dropsy*. Unfortunately, we cannot tell whether the disease was organic or 'hysterical'.[2] A further difficulty arises from the obvious points of similarity between this story and the Cure of the Man with the Withered Hand (Mk. iii. 1–6) and the Healing of the Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity (Lk. xiii. 10–17). 'In all these three cases Jesus is described as performing the cure unasked and seemingly in order to drive home His teaching.'[3] In spite of these difficulties, it is, I think, a hasty criticism which dismisses the story as unhistorical. A cure lies at the root of the narrative, but interest in the Sabbath controversy has possibly obscured the record.[4] So far as the other healing miracles are concerned, we may say with justice that none of them need lead us to doubt the early date of Proto-Luke.

We certainly approach a more difficult question when we come to *The Raising of the Widow's Son* at Nain. Does this incident forbid the conclusion just stated in its relation to the miracles of Proto-Luke as a whole? I cannot think that it does. Even in the 'We-Sections' there is a case which St. Luke treats as a case of the raising of the dead (Acts xx. 9–12). In this incident the narrative itself (cf. Acts xx. 10) leads us to think that Eutychus was not really dead, though St. Luke was evidently of the opposite opinion. In the story of the young man at Nain we have no indication at all within the narrative itself which suggests that the case was one of apparent death. Whether,

[1] We have already discussed the possibility that originally in Proto-Luke the story of the High Priest's Servant was the story of the healing of a wounded or bruised ear. See p. 46.

[2] Cf. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 125 f..

[3] Cf. Micklem, *op. cit.*, p. 126, cf. p. 93.

[4] Cf. Micklem (*op. cit.*, p. 93—with reference to the Cure of the Man with the Withered Hand): 'It is easy, and I think legitimate to conjecture that the original features of the event have been distorted, owing to the fact that the Evangelists had focussed their attention almost exclusively on the controversy without giving due proportion to all the elements in the whole scene as a simple historical record.'

nevertheless, we ought to take this view is a question which obviously cannot be considered here. It is, however, the duty of the historical critic to take the harder alternative, and, if we do this, our conclusion must be that in any case there is nothing whatever in the story which cannot have been believed and taught long before A.D. 60. The story of the Widow's Son is entirely unlike the kind of florid overgrowth which is the product of fancy and invention, and not even here have we reason to think that St. Luke is out of touch with good historical tradition. To accept this conclusion is really to say that no miracle of Jesus, related on the sole authority of Proto-Luke, stamps that document as an unhistorical work. One point, however, must be noted which presents itself not only in the miracle-stories, but also in the other narratives of Proto-Luke previous to the account of the Passion. This feature is the curious combination of simplicity and directness with a certain vagueness of outline. The incidents are not shrouded with legendary accretions, but they are seen as through a veil, by which details and sharp outlines are hidden. This combination of simplicity and vagueness suggests that while the narratives rest upon early and good tradition, they may not have been obtained by the Evangelist at absolutely first hand.[1] Reason to think this will also be found in our discussion of the narratives of the Resurrection.

Before leaving the present topic, further reference must be made to the Lukan story of *The Agony*. It would be an easy way of meeting the difficulties which this narrative raises to endorse the widely accepted view that Lk. xxii. 43–4 is an interpolation. It is, however, seriously open to question if we ought not to regard its absence from important manuscripts as an example of doctrinal omission.[2] The passage emphasizes the human side of Christ's sufferings, whereas even in New Testament times there existed widespread tendencies to shun the more human aspects of the Incarnation. A passage which describes Jesus as strengthened by an angel, and subject to an

[1] This is an added reason for the suggestion (see p. 211) that the tradition of the women (Lk. viii. 1–3) reached St. Luke through the daughters of Philip the Evangelist.

[2] See p. 44.

inner struggle so intense as to produce a bloody sweat, has strong claims to be regarded as early rather than late.[1] Moreover, the objective manner in which it speaks of the Agony is paralleled by the way in which Proto-Luke speaks of the descent of the Spirit at the Baptism and of the Resurrection Body of Jesus.

The more important topics connected with the Lukan Resurrection narratives, such as the place of the Appearances and the nature of the Resurrection Body, have already received attention.[2] Here it remains for us to consider *The three Resurrection stories which are peculiar to Proto-Luke*—the Journey to Emmaus, the Appearance to the Apostles, and the Parting of Jesus from His Disciples. If we allow for the presuppositions which may have influenced St. Luke's references to the Resurrection Body of Jesus, the substance of these narratives bespeaks early and good tradition. The life-like character of the story of the Journey to Emmaus requires more than the skill of the writer for its explanation. The despair of the two disciples, the silence regarding the name of one, their slowness to accept the women's testimony, the manner in which they recognize the Risen Christ, their swift return to Jerusalem—all these are signs of an early tradition which it is hypercriticism to discredit.

The one point of difficulty in the story is the reference to Peter in Lk. xxiv. 34. If this verse is accepted at its face value, the Appearance to Peter must have taken place in or near Jerusalem. This fact is pressed by those who, like the Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, reject Lk. xxiv. in favour of what is presumed to be the evidence of the lost end of Mk. We simply lack the materials for a confident opinion on this matter, but even if Lk. xxiv. 34 is the proof that St. Luke has telescoped the story of the original facts, this does not seriously diminish the historical value of his narrative. The accurate dating of events is not in the forefront of the writer's purpose in Lk. xxiv. He appears to include them all within a period of twenty-four hours, and this may have been his belief at the time of writing. His positive witness will remain even if he was mistaken in this opinion. We shall take leave to think that he does not write down his story from the lips of an actual eyewitness, but we shall

[1] Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 137.

[2] See pp. 227, 242 ff.

have no reason to doubt that he is separated by more than a few removes from such testimony, and this is exactly what the Proto-Luke Hypothesis itself suggests. One thing is certain; the representation which in Lk. xxiv. assigns the Appearances to a single day is not the hallmark of a late narrative. If it is an error, it is an early error. Those narratives which belong to the close of the first century presuppose a period of at least several days during which Appearances of Jesus were experienced. This is the case in Mt. xxviii. and Jn. xx., and, if we interpret the forty days of Acts i. 3 as a round number, St. Luke's later work is in agreement with this view. Thus it appears that, as a literary production of the same period, Lk. xxiv. is strange indeed. The presumption is that it belongs to an earlier time. In part, no doubt, this argument is discounted by St. Luke's alleged deficiency in the sense of time, but the later we date Lk. xxiv. the more difficult it is to rest satisfied with this explanation. We account for the Lukan narratives best if we place them in the sixties.

We may note finally the bearing of an important negative feature of the narratives of Lk. xxiv. which is instanced by Dr. F. C. Burkitt in *Christian Beginnings* (pp. 93–7). Dr. Burkitt points out that while many early Christians did not scruple to make the Risen Christ 'a mouthpiece for their views', the Lukan narratives are practically free from this tendency. 'How gracious is the story of the Two Disciples and their walk to Emmaus! We seem to see Jesus accompanying them and joining in their troubled and anxious talk. But no fresh revelation is recorded by Luke' (p. 95). Lk. xxiv. 25 f., 44–8 are not real exceptions; 'Luke does not even think proper to name one single proof-text' (*ibid.*). The nearest approach to a fresh saying is Lk. xxiv. 49, which bids the witnesses remain in Jerusalem, and this springs out of the historical situation portrayed. Dr. Burkitt is well entitled to ask if the facts do not supply 'a fair measure of the Lucan intellectual honesty' and of the Evangelist's 'scientific scruple as an historian' (p. 96). The fact to which Dr. Burkitt draws attention is significant whatever date we assign to the Lukan Resurrection narrative, but clearly it is best explained if we assign these narratives to the early date posited by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

Here our investigation of the historical value of Proto-Luke must end. Our conclusion is that, whether we have regard to the agreements or differences between this document and other authorities, or whether we test the evidence which is peculiar to itself, we have good reason to trust it as an early and reliable historical work. Proto-Luke provides us with no master-key with which to open every door we should like to enter, but it is certainly a first-class authority 'comparable to Mark'. Its study does not in the least lead us to disparage Mk., or to make impossible claims for Jn., but in important respects it does permit us to supplement these Gospels, and in a measure this is true of the Third Gospel also. In many cases we can support their evidence by the aid of Proto-Luke, and in other cases we can subject their witness to criticism. Thus, Proto-Luke is an added help to the critic who above all else desires to cut the highway for true historical progress. In truth, Proto-Luke is a tool which must be handled with knowledge and discretion, with regard to its limitations as well as to its real merits, but it is one which, far from breaking in our hands, will help us to make a way towards the distant goal.

X

THE THEOLOGY OF PROTO-LUKE

In the present chapter the theology of Proto-Luke will be discussed only in so far as it bears on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. If the theory is sound, the theology of the document is not merely St. Luke's theology, but substantially[1] represents his doctrinal ideas in and about A. D. 65. This fact invests the theory with a deeper interest and supplies a further test of its validity. The questions which arise bear upon the date, authorship, and historical value of Proto-Luke, and include the following: Are the portraiture of Jesus and the account of His Message congruous with the date to which we have assigned Proto-Luke? Is the theological point of view like that of the Acts and the rest of the Third Gospel? Is its teaching of such a character that we can regard Proto-Luke as a trustworthy authority 'comparable to Mark'? It is not likely that, with the material at our disposal, we can give a complete answer to these questions, but they are problems which naturally arise, and which a frank discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis must be prepared to meet. The best method of treatment will be to consider the teaching of Jesus in Proto-Luke, its portraiture of Jesus, and finally its Christology.

§ 1. *The Teaching of Jesus.*

Like the Synoptic Gospels, Proto-Luke has many references to the Kingdom of God.[2] The central idea is that of a Reign of God, which in a measure is already present but has yet to be

[1] No doubt we must allow for the possibility of a certain amount of editorial modification at the time when St. Luke compiled the Third Gospel, but I do not think it will have been considerable. See an earlier reference to this point on page 214 f.

[2] The phrase occurs twenty times, and there are six other cases where the Kingdom is mentioned in various ways (xi. 1, xii. 31–2, xxii. 29–30, xxiii. 42). At least five times the reference is to a present Kingdom, but there are about a dozen instances where a future reference is clear.

consummated. The usage of Proto-Luke thus closely resembles that of Mk. and Q, where the prevailing reference is to the future, with occasional but clear indications that a present Kingdom is in view. In no case in Proto-Luke is the Kingdom of God a synonym for the Christian Church, though possibly there is an approach to this conception in xxii. 29 ('I appoint unto you a kingdom'), where there appears to be a distinction from the Kingdom proper in the words which follow ('that ye may eat and drink . . . in my kingdom').

The absence of any parables regarding the Kingdom, except those of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, is remarkable. The Parable of the Pounds is said to have been uttered in consequence of the belief of some that the Kingdom was near, but otherwise the parables of Proto-Luke are stories of human life dealing with such themes as prayer, covetousness, forgiveness, service, and the joy of finding. It is noteworthy, however, that the prevailing temper of mind lying behind the references to the Kingdom is much the same as that reflected in the parables. Thus, the 'good tidings' of the Kingdom are mentioned (viii. 1) and it is the joyous mission of the Seventy to proclaim its advent (x. 9, 11). The Kingdom is the gift of the Father's good pleasure (xii. 32) and is expressly associated with the joys of fellowship (xxii. 16, 18, 30). Men will come from all points of the compass and sit down in the Kingdom of God (xiii. 29), while for the disciples there are reserved thrones of judgement, from which as assessors they will judge the twelve tribes of Israel (xxii. 30). Apart from the last passage, the Kingdom is not presented in Proto-Luke as an eschatological idea. It does not come with observation (xvii. 20), and its presence is nowhere associated with the Coming of the Son of man. Indeed, in Proto-Luke the idea of the Parousia appears to be segregated; its suddenness is emphasized, but for any closely conceived connexion between it and the establishment of the Kingdom we look in vain. The Kingdom is not something of which men will be able to say, 'Lo, here! or, There!', for it is 'in' or 'among' them (xvii. 21). Exactly the contrary is asserted of the Parousia, which is described as a spectacular event. The Son of man will come as lightning (xvii. 24), and His Coming will have the unexpectedness of the Deluge (xvii. 26 f.) and of the destruction of the Cities

of the Plain (xvii. 28 ff.). It will surprise men in the midst of the ordinary pursuits of life, while they are on the house-top or at work in the field (xvii. 31).[1] It would seem as if St. Luke records this strain of teaching mainly because he finds it in his Q source;[2] he records it, but it does not lie in the pathway of his main interests or those of the special tradition which he embodies. It is the teaching regarding the Kingdom which has the greater pull upon his sympathies. To him the Kingdom is a present experience which anticipates the joyous fellowship of the Age to Come. It is probable that in this interest we have the explanation of the peculiar character of the Lukan parables. It may even be that to St. Luke our common distinction between 'parables of the Kingdom' and 'parables of human life' would have been meaningless. At any rate, the upshot of our inquiry appears to be that a common interest and point of view explain alike St. Luke's references to the Kingdom, his limited treatment of the Parousia, and the character of his parabolic matter. This fact, if it is true, supports the view that Proto-Luke represents very few lines of early tradition; it is not a collection of diverse materials, but has a unity and a tendency of its own.

If the position just stated can be further illustrated, it is obviously one of the greatest importance. I believe that such support is forthcoming in the teaching regarding Wealth, Divine Grace, and Forgiveness, for in Proto-Luke this teaching stands against the background of an interest in life and its complex social and spiritual relationships.

The exposure of the perils of riches is by no means limited to Proto-Luke (cf. Mk. x. 17–31), but it is in this document that the subject receives its fullest treatment. It is an exaggeration to say that an ascetic motive governs the teaching given. Covetousness and the worldly spirit are the evils exposed in the Parable of the Rich Fool, the self-centredness of the rich man is the point of the Parable of Dives, while in the Parable of the Unjust Steward the man's astuteness is commended. Riches are

[1] Cf. also xii. 35–48. The attitude of the disciples is to be one of readiness. With loins girded and lamps burning they are to await one whose coming is like the return of a master or the approach of a thief in the night.

[2] The only references in QL which are not taken from Q are xviii. 7 f., xxii. 69, and perhaps xxiii. 29–31. Probably the last passage refers rather to the Fall of Jerusalem.

'unrighteous mammon', but they are none the less a trust (xvi. 11). It is the evil with which wealth is so easily associated which lies behind the Lukan teaching; the interest is an interest in men in the complex social order. It is clear that such teaching was especially acceptable to St. Luke and his informants. But has the sympathy coloured the tradition? In the main, I do not think that this is so. The only arguable instance to the contrary is the form given to the Beatitudes. The term 'the poor', as used in Jewish religious literature,[1] left open the possibility that Christ was referring to material poverty, and St. Luke appears to have read the words in this sense. The First Evangelist takes the opposite view, and while his language[2] less accurately reproduces the original words, it more faithfully reflects their meaning.

In the case of the teaching about Wealth a further step is possible. Immediately we find a special interest in this teaching on the part of the author of Proto-Luke, the presence of similar interests in the Acts becomes important. The references to the fact that the early Christians had all things in common (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 32–5), the statement regarding Barnabas and his field (iv. 36 f.), the story of Ananias and Sapphira (v. 1–11), the cry of Peter, 'Silver and gold have I none' (iii. 6), the rebuke addressed to Simon the sorcerer, 'Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money' (viii. 20), the frequent references to almsgiving (x. 2, 4, 31, xxiv. 17)—these features support critical reasons which find the author of Proto-Luke in the writer of the Acts.

A further illustration of our argument is provided by the teaching about Grace and Forgiveness. As we have seen, an emphasis on Grace marks the opening Sermon at Nazareth. This emphasis is further illustrated in the Lukan saying, 'What thank (χάρις) have ye?' (vi. 33 f.), in the characteristic use of εὐαγγελίζομαι,[3] and in the words 'never despairing', or according to another reading, 'despairing of no man', in reference to lending (vi. 35). Forgiveness, it is taught, is to be readily accorded whenever there is penitence (xvii. 3 f.), while the ground of our

[1] Cf. E. F. Scott, *D.C.G.*, ii, p. 386 f.
[2] 'Blessed are the poor in spirit' (Mt. v. 2).
[3] Cf. Hawkins, *HS*[2], p. 19.

own forgiveness is the plea, 'for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us' (xi. 4). Behind this teaching is St. Luke's doctrine of the Grace of God. Everywhere God is presented as the Father. For this representation the Evangelist is partly indebted to Q, but it is just as marked in the sayings which belong to his special tradition. God is kind toward the unthankful (vi. 35). It is the good pleasure of His Fatherhood to give the Kingdom to men (xii. 32). His joy is the finding of the lost (xv.). It is through the exercises of love that men become His sons (vi. 35). These notes in the teaching of Proto-Luke are re-echoed in the Hymns of the Nativity (i. 46 ff., 68 ff., ii. 14, 29 ff.), and in the frequent references in the Acts to the 'grace of God' (xi. 23, xiii. 43, xiv. 3, 26, &c.).

Other prominent features in the teaching of Proto-Luke are Prayer, Humility, Joy, and Faith. The interest in these subjects can easily be paralleled in other parts of the Lukan writings, but it is best to restrict the argument to matters which are fundamental. It may be noted, however, how congruous these themes are with the tendencies which have been mentioned; Prayer especially receives just that broad sympathetic treatment which is characteristic of Proto-Luke. Faith in relation to healing is emphasized just as it is in Mk. In one story, however, that of the Woman in the City, faith is associated with forgiveness, where no question of healing is involved (cf. vii. 50, 'Thy faith hath saved thee'). This representation is peculiar to Proto-Luke, but it lies in the track of teaching present both in Mk. and Lk. Even in Mk. healing is not a purely physical matter (cf. ii. 5–9). In Lk. xvii. 11–19 (The Ten Lepers) there is a combination of the ideas of physical and spiritual restoration, for it is to a man who returns to give glory to God that Jesus says, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole'. It is precarious, therefore, to find in Lk. vii. 50 an unhistorical trait, due to the preoccupation of St. Luke with the thought of Jesus as the Healer and Saviour of men. Interest in this aspect of the work of Jesus has preserved this teaching, but it has not created it. The restraint manifest in the story supports this view; no attempt is made to relate the woman's faith to the personality of Christ.

The inferences to be drawn from the above survey of the teaching of Jesus are matters of no small delicacy. The clearest

issue is the question of authorship. Here it is fair to urge that our unwillingness to dissociate the authorship of Proto-Luke from that of the rest of the Lukan writings receives strong confirmation. If Proto-Luke is an entity, the Evangelist is its author. But the very strength of this conclusion is our embarrassment. For, from the teaching of Proto-Luke alone, it is impossible to prove that this work is a separate document earlier than the Third Gospel. The theory remains one to be established by critical and historical arguments. Nevertheless, the results of our inquiry are important. The basal teaching of Proto-Luke is plainly seen to stand against a background of common interests; it represents a definite line of doctrinal tradition. This is entirely in agreement with the circumstances under which, by hypothesis, Proto-Luke came to be written. The teaching of Jesus has just that broad, humane character which it might be expected to have, if, in producing the document, St. Luke was dependent on traditions ultimately derived from the women who journeyed with the Apostolic band from Galilee to Jerusalem. More than this I do not think we are entitled to claim, but the importance of this result is seen in the fact that, if the contrary were true, we should have a formidable objection to the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

§ 2. *The Portrait of Jesus.*

It would be quite easy to support the conclusions reached in the last section by the details of the portraiture of Jesus, for the portrait is harmonious with the teaching. Thus, the Jesus of Proto-Luke is the friend of publicans and sinners. His sympathies are not limited by Jewish particularism; they embrace Samaritans as well as Jews. He fully enters into the experiences of human life, freely accepts hospitality, and converses with men along the roads. His mission is to bring good tidings to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, to proclaim the 'acceptable year' of the Lord's deliverance. The sympathies which underlie this representation of Jesus are precisely those implied in the account of His teaching, and in the earliest Christian preaching in the Acts.[1]

[1] Cf. Acts ii. 22 ff., iii. 13, 26, viii. 26 ff., x. 36, 38.

EVANGELICAL SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Instead of covering this ground a second time, it will be better to consider *the historical aspects of the portrait.* Does the figure of Jesus reveal primitive traits? Has it a definiteness of outline which is the result of more than the writer's art? Does the picture preserve the note of reality, and yet, at the same time, a sense of wonder adequate to the real greatness of Jesus?

So far as the impression made by Jesus upon His contemporaries is concerned, the writer's account leaves little to be desired. He is successful in showing the stir created by the opening of the Galilean Mission and the wonderful popularity of Jesus (cf. iv. 14 f., 20, 22, vii. 16, &c.). In the same clear way the opposite side is given—the anger aroused by the outspokenness of Jesus (iv. 28 f.), and the hatred provoked in the hearts of the scribes (xi. 53 f.). Nothing could be more vivid than the description of the attentiveness of the congregation at Nazareth. We read of the surmises of the people at Nain (vii. 16), the murmuring of the inhabitants of Jericho (xix. 7), the hopes and opinions of the disciples (xxiv. 19, 21). Nor is there a want of more subtle suggestions. The acts of Jesus provoke fear (vii. 16), His words cause shame (xiii. 17), while contact with Him awakens the sense of sin (v. 8). The desire of the people to touch Jesus is a primitive trait, and equally so St. Luke's explanation, 'for power came forth from him' (vi. 19). That the idea represents popular belief is also evidenced by the words of Mk. vi. 58 regarding the sick in the market-places, who sought to touch 'if it were but the border of his garment'.

Turning from the people, we require to look more closely at the figure of Jesus Himself. Of the *graciousness* of the Lukan Jesus we need say no more, but it is important to note *a certain sternness or severity* which St. Luke has succeeded in combining with it. A clear example is found in the words addressed to the three candidates for discipleship (ix. 57-62). These cases, or at least two of them, are taken from Q, but the same severity is present in sayings which are peculiar to Lk. As represented by St. Luke, Jesus is not a teacher who makes the way easy (xiv. 33). He bids men count the cost, and this, not as a counsel of mere prudence, but as a challenge to themselves. For His service they have to give and hazard all they

have, else they are like savourless salt, fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill (xiv. 34 f.). Discipleship is cross-bearing (xiv. 27); it is a way of renunciation which includes the severing of the tenderest of human ties (xiv. 26). Such claims give to the figure of Jesus a massive strength which the art of St. Luke does not conceal.

In keeping with the demands which Jesus makes upon His disciples is *the clarity with which He sees the purpose and the issues of His Mission.* That Mission means suffering for Himself and division amongst men (xii. 49–53). There is laid upon Jesus a sense of urgency which brooks neither warning nor delay: 'Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way . . .' The words of ix. 51 ('And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up') show that the Evangelist recognized this spirit as a cardinal element in his portraiture of Jesus. They mark the approach of an event determined in the counsels of God. But, if so, the words, 'he stedfastly set his face', add the thought of an obedience which is active. In setting out upon the fateful journey Jesus is not meeting the dictates of fate; He is making His own the purposes of God.[1] This representation of the mind of Jesus is no fringe loosely added to the Lukan portraiture; it belongs essentially to the picture of One who, above all else, is presented as the Son of man who came to seek and to save that which was lost. From beginning to end Proto-Luke is dominated by the thought of the Passion. It is this which explains the prominence given to the last journey to Jerusalem and its tragic sequel. The more fully this is recognized, the more striking becomes the simplicity of the realism with which the personality of Jesus is pictured. If we will, Proto-Luke is a story written to a thesis, and yet it lacks the artificiality to which such attempts are so easily exposed. The presumption is that it represents interests and beliefs shaped by the experiences of those in close touch with the career of Jesus.

[1] Cf. Jn. vi. 38: 'For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' To these words it is impossible not to see a parallel in the thought of Lk. ix. 51, and still more in the prayer of Lk. xxii. 42 and the dying cry of Jesus, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Lk. xxiii. 46).

As an illustration of *the realism of Proto-Luke*, perhaps the best example is Lk. x. 17–20. The return of the Seventy, flushed with success, creates for Jesus the vision of a battle already won: 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven' (x. 18). It is in this experience of spiritual exaltation that He describes the commission which the Seventy have received: 'Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall in any wise hurt you' (x. 19). To describe this language as figurative is only to confess the greatness of its claims, for herein Jesus is revealed as both sword and armour to His disciples. In the grim fight against evil they are by Him both authorized and sealed. Great as the claim undoubtedly is, anything more unlike a fictitious account of the giving of a commission it would be difficult to cite. The final words, 'Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven', are especially lifelike.

It is by now abundantly clear that Proto-Luke does not present us with an abstraction but with a virile personality. The portraiture is everywhere confined within the bounds of a full and complete humanity. Omniscience is nowhere predicated of Jesus. Where He is represented as knowing the thoughts of others (xi. 17, cf. vii. 40), the knowledge is that of deep spiritual insight. There is in the figure of Jesus a balance of poise; the highest claims are associated with a real human experience. Although He can exult in spirit, and knows that there are times when, if men are silent, the very stones must cry out, He has no love for mere adulation (xi. 27 f.). The Lukan Jesus suffers the pain of desires which cannot be fulfilled on earth (xxii. 15); He makes supplication for that which is not granted (xxii. 32); He endures the direst anguish as death draws near. If, as we have claimed, xxii. 43 f. belongs to Proto-Luke, He is divinely strengthened in the hour of trial, when His sweat becomes as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground. For Him temptation is an experience repeated more than once (iv. 13). 'Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations,' He says to His disciples, and while the word is here used in the broad sense of life and its tribulations, it is

significant that πειρασμός is used.[1] In such a portraiture the frequent references to prayer are in every way harmonious. Before choosing the Twelve, He spends a whole night in prayer to God (vi. 12). It is when He is praying that the disciples ask for instruction in prayer (xi. 1). He prays for others (xxii. 32) and for Himself (xxii. 41); as His agony increases He prays 'more earnestly' (xxii. 44). If the claim that St. Luke, like St. Matthew, frequently omits Markan statements which attribute human emotion to Jesus is just, it clearly requires to be qualified by the examples of the opposite tendency manifest in Proto-Luke.

From what has been found, it is evident that the questions stated at the beginning of the present section must be answered in the affirmative. The figure of Jesus does reveal those primitive traits which point to a good tradition. It has a definiteness of outline for which the writer's art is but partly responsible. In no way artificial, the portrait has the note of reality, with suggestions of a greatness which spring naturally out of the portraiture itself. Perhaps the most noticeable feature is its *unity*, the combination of graciousness and strength, the association of high claims and imperious demands with an intensely human experience. The picture has much in common with the Markan delineation, and yet it occurs in portions of Lk. which owe nothing to Mk. We cannot say that its character proves Proto-Luke to be a real literary entity, but, as in the case of the teaching of Jesus, force is certainly added to the critical reasons which point to this conclusion. Doubtless the implications of the Lukan portraiture remain the same if no part of the Third Gospel was penned until the eighties or nineties, but they are more easily explained if Proto-Luke is a document of the sixties. On this view, we more naturally account for the freshness and vigour of the Lukan picture of Jesus.

We cannot press this conclusion farther until we have examined the Christology of Proto-Luke, for Christology supplies us with a finer test by which to estimate the unity and date of a document. To this, the final stage of our inquiry, we must now turn.

[1] Cf. Acts xx. 19: 'serving the Lord with . . . tears, and with trials (πειρασμῶν) which befell me . . .', and Acts xiv. 22: 'and that through many tribulations (θλίψεων) we must enter into the kingdom of God'.

§ 3. *Christology.*

In studying the Christology of Proto-Luke, our object is to discover whether it is early or late. Is it such as might reasonably be expected in so early a document, or does it contain elements which are the hallmarks of a later time?

The first matters for inquiry are the various *names and titles* of Jesus, for it is by the use of these that a writer's attitude to the Person of Christ is often revealed. In Proto-Luke the list includes the following: ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ κύριος, 'the Christ', 'Son of man', Son of God', and 'the Son'. Jesus is also addressed by the vocatives Ἰησοῦ, κύριε, and ἐπιστάτα, and is described as a 'prophet' and as 'the King of the Jews'. Most of these terms are used as in Mk. and Q, but the titles ὁ κύριος and κύριε call for further notice. In Proto-Luke each occurs fifteen times.[1] In view of two Markan examples (vii. 28, xi. 3), and of those found in Q,[2] it ought not to be denied that Jesus was addressed by these titles, but the evidence of Mk. clearly shows that the names generally used were 'Rabbi' and its equivalent διδάσκαλος. The facts strongly suggest that κύριε and ὁ κύριος are used because of a certain significance which they possess; they are terms of respect, equivalent in meaning to 'Sir' or 'Milord'.[3]

But is this the whole story? In the first three centuries κύριος was used in the mystery religions with reference to the Cult-hero to whose household or service the devotee believed himself to belong, and a parallel has been drawn by Bousset in *Kyrios Christos* between this usage and the Christian confession 'Jesus is Lord'. The Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* contend that when the Aramaic term 'maran' was translated by κύριος, the latter carried with it its Greek religious connotation, with the result that Jesus was looked upon as a Divine κύριος, 'the Lord of a circle of initiates who worshipped him' (Pt. I, vol. i, p. 416). Whatever be the truth of this contention, the

[1] Κύριε occurs in v. 8, vi. 46, vii. 6, ix. 54, 61, x. 17, 40, xi. 1, xii. 41, xiii. 23, xvii. 37, xix. 8, xxii. 33, 38, 49; ὁ κύριος is found in vii. 13, 19, x. 1, 39, 41, xi. 39, xii. 42, xiii. 15, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 61 (*bis*), xxiv. 34.

[2] Mt. vii. 21 = Lk. vi. 46; Mt. viii. 8 = Lk. vii. 6. Cf. also Mt. vii. 22, viii. 6, 21 (Lk. ix. 59?).

[3] Cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. i, p. 409; *Christian Beginnings*, p. 46.

use of the term in Proto-Luke shows no sign of the development described. Later in point of date than 1 Cor. xii. 3[1] and Rom. x. 9,[2] the Lukan usage precedes the Pauline in the order of the development of thought. Indeed, the use of *κύριος* in Proto-Luke is demonstrably earlier than that of the Acts, where the Lord is the object of faith and the only hope of salvation.[3] In Proto-Luke *κύριος* is always used in narrative, and does not rise above the level of a term of respect or high regard. There are, as a matter of fact, several cases where the term is used as a literary equivalent for the name 'Jesus' (cf. xiv. 15, xix. 8, xxii. 42). The evidence as a whole suggests that in the use of the word there is no more than the rudimentary beginnings of a Christology—a bridge, if we will, by which to pass over to the fuller development of the term in the Pauline theology and in the Acts.

Leaving the use of names and titles, we must next consider *the manner in which Jesus is viewed in relation to Old Testament prophecy*. The slight extent to which the Old Testament is quoted is a marked feature of Proto-Luke. There are, of course, numerous cases where Old Testament ideas and phrases lie behind the language of St. Luke, but only four passages are expressly quoted. Of these iii. 4 ff. (Isa. xl. 3 ff.) refers to the Baptist, and iii. 22 (Ps. ii. 7) gives the words of the Divine Voice at the Baptism of Jesus. The remaining two citations which are peculiar to Proto-Luke are iv. 18 f. and xxii. 37. The former passage ('*The Spirit of the Lord is upon me* . . .') quotes Isa. lxi. 1 f.; it throws into the foreground ideas which are most characteristic of the Lukan Jesus. He is One who is Spirit-possessed, and His mission is to the poor and the distressed. In iv. 21 the prophet's words are said to be fulfilled in the career of Jesus. In all this there is nothing mechanical or artificial, nothing which corresponds to the Matthaean use of the phrase, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet'. Words which the prophet had used long ago, perhaps of himself, are declared by Jesus to be 'filled up' in His Person

[1] 'No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit.'

[2] 'Because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.'

[3] Cf. Acts iv. 12, x. 43, xi. 17, xiii. 38 f., xvi. 31, &c. These are the relevant passages cited by Lake and Jackson.

and Mission. The manner in which the passage is cited supports the view that Proto-Luke is a trustworthy authority. It is reasonable to believe that the early Christian habit of applying Old Testament prophecies to Christ had its beginning in the practice of Jesus Himself, and if we take this view no passage has the claim of the one under review to be regarded as a genuine citation of His.

The second passage adds the note of tragedy lacking in iv. 18 f.: *For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment* (xxii. 37 = Isa. liii. 12). According to Proto-Luke, Jesus saw His approaching suffering and death in the light of the Second Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant; like the Servant, He Himself was to be 'classed with criminals'. It is common knowledge that the historical character of this citation has frequently been denied. What we have in xxii. 37, it is said, is a reflection of the light in which the early followers of Jesus viewed His Crucifixion and Death.[1] They identified Him with the Servant, and read back into His teaching their own brooding and speculation. It may be seriously doubted if criticism really favours this view. It is more than a detail that xxii. 37 does not say 'that which is written *of me*', but 'that which is written *must be fulfilled in me*'. The former is more after the fashion which an attempt to introduce an unhistorical reference to Scripture would be likely to take. Thus, the restraint of the passage favours its genuineness. The restraint is even more remarkable if we can translate the words καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει by the rendering, 'For my affairs (or, "my life and work") are at an end'.[2] So translated, the words justify the quotation from Isaiah and explain the impetuous cry, 'Lord, behold, here are two swords'. Nor is it unfair to speak of the spiritual insight of Jesus in His use of the Old Testament. No satisfactory reason can be given why He should not have thought deeply about the work and destiny of the Servant and have

[1] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. i, pp. 390 ff., and *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 35 ff. For Burkitt's earlier and better opinion, see *G.H.T.*, pp. 141 n., 202 f.

[2] Cf. Swete's note in *Studies in the Teaching of our Lord*, p. 111. The plural is used in this sense in xxiv. 19, 27, and is read here in AΧΓΔ and f.

found a parallel in His own tragic story. On the one hand, xxii. 37 does not reproduce the manner in which the pious musings of early Christianity would have expressed themselves; on the other hand, the passage does illustrate that free handling of Scripture which we know to have been characteristic of Jesus. Moreover, it appears to have been part of the special tradition reflected in Proto-Luke that Jesus did find the key to His suffering career in the Old Testament (cf. xxiv. 7, 26, 46; Acts viii. 26 ff.). This may be viewed as an aftergrowth, but we account for it best if we believe that Jesus gave it its initial impulse. For these reasons, I think, we ought to explain xxii. 37 as a saying, precious to the Caesarean community, which it is the merit of Proto-Luke to have preserved.

The Christology suggested by the two quotations is, of course, latent. Implicitly, they connect the life and death of Jesus with the Divine ordering of history; Jesus comes in the fullness of time to fulfil a ministry of Grace by a way which issues in suffering and death.

We must now turn to the two main ideas by means of which the author of Proto-Luke expresses his Christology such as it is. These are found in his teaching regarding the Spirit in relation to Jesus and his doctrine of Sonship.

From the very beginning of His ministry Jesus is represented as '*Spirit-filled*'. This experience has been defined as 'a man's consciousness that his action and speech are being governed by a compelling force, separate from the ordinary process of volition' (Lake, *op. cit.*, Part I, vol. i, p. 286). That such was, in a very marked degree, the experience of Jesus is clearly taught by the author of Proto-Luke. The Spirit is viewed as a Divine energy, a Power by which the recipient is charged with new powers and purposes. The inflow of power is the witness of the story of the Temptation, but it is the purposes which are specially emphasized in Proto-Luke. It is when Jesus is 'full of the Holy Spirit' that He returns from the Jordan (iv. 1 a); under the direction of the Spirit that He goes into the wilderness (iv. 1 b); 'in the power of the Spirit' that He begins His public ministry (iv. 14). There is no slavish adherence to any one mode of describing the Spirit's operation. If the Spirit descends upon, fills, and directs Jesus, the idea of the Spirit as the medium of an

experience is also present. Thus, it is 'in the Holy Spirit' that Jesus rejoices, and reveals the consciousness of a unique filial relationship to God (x. 21). In the teaching of Jesus there are passages which imply a conception of the Spirit which is practically that of personality. The Spirit, for example, is viewed as the object of blasphemy (xii. 10), and as the teacher who gives to persecuted disciples the witness they are to utter (xii. 12). This conception, however, is almost entirely limited to St. Luke's Q source; he does not introduce it himself, unless we are to find it in iv. 1 ('led by the Spirit'). In St. Luke's usage the idea of the Spirit is dynamic; in the words of Prof. A. L. Humphries, 'the Holy Spirit is the chrism of Jesus for His office'.[1] The same idea appears in xxiv. 49 in the words of Jesus to His disciples: 'Tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high.' But it is especially in relation to Jesus Himself that St. Luke speaks of the power of the Spirit, and we must infer that it was by this thought that he explained to himself the spiritual greatness of Jesus. But if so, the facts suggest that the Evangelist was not content with this line of approach alone. Thus, in Proto-Luke he has a doctrine of the Sonship of Christ for which he is only partly indebted to Q. To this aspect of his Christology we must now turn.

The *Sonship of Christ* first meets us in the story of the Baptism. In this narrative the descent of the Spirit and the words of the Heavenly Voice are closely connected. It is when the Spirit descends that the Sonship is confessed. The story is often said to imply the belief that Jesus is the Son of God by adoption. Possibly this thought is latent in the quotation from Ps. ii.,[2] but I do not think that we can say more. In any case, the suggestion of the Genealogy is that St. Luke's belief was more profound. I have contended elsewhere that originally the Genealogy lacked the words 'as was supposed' (iii. 23), and that this phrase was added by St. Luke at the time when he first wrote i. 34 f.[3] This implies that in Proto-Luke the Genealogy described Jesus as the son of Joseph, and, in the light of iii. 22 and iv. 22,[4] this is in

[1] Cf. *The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience*, p. 136.
[2] See p. 77.
[3] Cf. *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, pp. 34-46.
[4] 'Is not this Joseph's son?'

every way the best view to take. The standpoint is simply that of primitive Christianity, and is without prejudice to the later doctrine of the Virgin Birth. But we have not said the really important thing about the Genealogy if we say that it describes Jesus as the son of Joseph. Its purpose is not to state this, but to trace the descent of Jesus, through Joseph and David, back to the first beginnings of the human race, and beyond to God Himself. It is the product of a nascent Christology which seeks to relate His Person to humanity and to God. The Genealogy tells us that Jesus is the son of Joseph; it teaches that He is the Son of God. Needless to say, this teaching is naïve and undefined. I do not think that we are entitled to find in it any thought of Christ as 'the Second Adam', the Spiritual Head of a redeemed race. That later ideas are foreshadowed in the Genealogy, I can well believe, but we are only reading into it our own speculation if we find more than the first gropings of Christological thought.

Although the story of the Temptation is taken from Q, it probably illustrates the sense in which St. Luke himself uses the term 'Son of God'. In this story the Sonship of Jesus is deeply ethical and religious. It is a Sonship which demands restraint in the exercise of miraculous power: 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' It is also a Sonship consistent with the worship and service of God: 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' The importance of this quotation has not been sufficiently realized; it is one which would hardly have been made if an advanced doctrine of Sonship lay behind the story. The Sonship is clearly moral and volitional; it consists in perfect submission to, and conformity with, the mind and will of God.

But if such is the Lukan conception of the Sonship of Jesus, there are striking passages in Proto-Luke which carry us farther. In order to illustrate this, we do not need to cite the important Q passage, x. 22[1] (= Mt. xi. 27), which is still, as it always will be, the storm-centre of controversy.[2] There are two passages, peculiar to Proto-Luke, which imply a conception of Sonship

[1] 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.'

[2] Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, vol. i, p. 396.

with a note of authority and a closeness of filial relationship beyond anything found in the ordinary Christian consciousness. These passages are xxii. 29: 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me', and xxiv. 49: 'And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you.' In neither passage is the word 'Son' used, but the thought is unmistakable. It is as the Son that Jesus assigns dominion to His disciples and announces the gift of the Spirit. In neither passage is a metaphysical doctrine of Sonship present, but many will rightly think that we are on the verge of such a conception. Proto-Luke approaches a frontier which, apart from x. 22, it does not actually cross; its doctrine of Sonship is personal and volitional, with suggestions of deeper meaning which are not worked out.

In considering the Christology of Proto-Luke, we cannot fail to note its unity of standpoint. Its characteristic ideas are few. *Christ is the Divine Son, anointed by God, who in filial obedience fulfils a ministry of Grace involving suffering and death; such, in brief, is the theology of Proto-Luke, and its picture of Jesus and account of His teaching are in the closest harmony with it.*

The fundamental agreement of this teaching with the theology of other parts of the Lukan writings needs no lengthy elaboration. In the Birth Stories of Lk. i., ii. Jesus is announced as 'the Son of the Most High' (i. 32). His coming means light for the Gentiles and glory for Israel (ii. 32). In the Acts Jesus is preached as the Son of God (ix. 20), and, as in Lk. iii. 22, the second Psalm is quoted in relation to Him (xiii. 33). In the days of His flesh God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power; He went about doing good (x. 38). He is the Servant whom God has glorified (iii. 13), raised up (iii. 26), and anointed (iv. 27). In viii. 26 ff. the application of Isa. liii. to Christ is discussed by Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch. Jesus is 'both Lord and Christ' (ii. 36), and, as in Proto-Luke, suffering is seen to be an essential part of His Messiahship (iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f.). Faith in His name brings healing (iii. 16, iv. 10, ix. 34), forgiveness (x. 43), and salvation (iv. 12, v. 31, xvi. 31). He is the 'Holy and Righteous One' (iii. 14), 'the Prince of life' (iii. 15), 'a Prince and a Saviour' (v. 31), a prophet like unto Moses (iii. 22, vii. 37).

The Gospel preached in His name breaks through national limitations; it embraces the Ethiopian eunuch (viii. 26 ff.), the Gentile Cornelius (x–xi. 18), the Greeks at Antioch (xi. 20). The promise is not only to Jews, but 'to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him' (ii. 39).

We may say, then, that the theology of Proto-Luke strongly confirms the view that its author is the Evangelist himself. But does it strengthen the case for presuming the existence of the document? The unity of its theology is certainly in agreement with the theory, but the stronger argument is its demonstrably early character.[1] Efforts to support the early date of the Third Gospel by the primitive cast of its theology have hitherto broken down in consequence of St. Luke's use of Mk. and his references to the destruction of Jerusalem. These attempts have broken down; and yet, in rejecting them, one has the feeling of something left over, not fully explained. For the primitive character of the theology is just as clear as the references to the events of A.D. 68–70, and equally cries out for explanation. It is the merit of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis that it meets this want; it permits us to do justice to the earlier and later elements in the Gospel. If we say that its theology belongs to a document which precedes the final work by a period of from fifteen to twenty years, we have a theory which covers all the facts of the case. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis remains a theory to be established by literary and historical criticism, but theology confirms their findings.

We may note finally that Proto-Luke answers to a definite purpose which the writer may be supposed to have had in view. Proto-Luke is not a scrap-book, but a work with a definite plan and standpoint. Cut out by methods of literary criticism from the Third Gospel, it is a work stamped with a clearly conceived conception of Christ. Christ is the Healer and Saviour of men, the anointed Servant of God. The Passion is the goal of His earthly life. His history lies in the way of Providential purpose and provides the ground for an Evangel of 'repentance and remission of sins' for 'all nations, beginning at Jerusalem' (xxiv.

[1] Cf. Streeter's remarks about St. Luke's theology in the Acts: 'What Acts really represents—modified a little by later experience and touched only here and there with a phrase caught up from Paul—is *pre-Pauline Gentile Christianity*' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 556).

46 f.). These words describe the drift of Proto-Luke almost as well as they describe that of the Third Gospel, and show that it provides a background to the faith and hope of the first believers. There is no reason to think that Proto-Luke circulated as an entity, but all the facts go to show that it was designed to answer the very purpose which the finished Gospel afterwards fulfilled.

§ 4. *The Theological Value of Proto-Luke.*

Theologically speaking, Proto-Luke is a book of beginnings, a link between the teaching of Christ and the theology of St. Paul and the Fourth Evangelist. In the Fourth Gospel we are indeed translated into a world very different from that of Proto-Luke, and many ideas are prominent which in the latter are not even in sight. None the less, there are notes in Proto-Luke which are repeatedly sounded in the richer harmonies of Jn. Such notes are the teaching regarding the obedience of Christ, His active embracing of the Father's will, the authority of His Sonship, His claim to impart the Spirit, the limited emphasis upon the Parousia, the thought of Jesus as the bringer of 'salvation' (σωτηρία, Lk. xix. 9, Jn. iv. 42).

The closer link, however, is between the teaching of Proto-Luke and the theology of St. Paul. In the degree we recognize that St. Luke was not a Paulinist, the parallelisms are the more important. The value of Proto-Luke is that it roots in the soil of early Gospel tradition ideas which St. Paul has developed in his teaching. Thus, Proto-Luke emphasizes the graciousness of Christ and His teaching; its author, in the words of Dante, is *scriba mansuetudinis Christi*.[1] The publican cries, 'God, be merciful to me a sinner', and goes down to his house justified rather than the proud Pharisee who boasts of his 'works'. In the presence of Jesus Simon is conscious of his sin, and cries, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man'. The harlot is forgiven because of her faith. Zacchaeus is a son of Abraham to whose house salvation is come. When they have done all, Christ's followers are to confess themselves 'unprofitable servants'; they have but done what it was their duty to do. Irenaeus describes St. Luke's

[1] Cited by Plummer, *I.C.C.*, *St. Lk.*, p. xlii.

Gospel as a record of the Gospel preached by St. Paul. This view, however, does not accurately describe the relation between the two writers. This relationship is well described by the late H. B. Swete: 'So far as Paulinism is to be found in the Lucan teaching, it may be claimed as an original element in Christianity, due to the Master Himself. It is Christ and not St. Paul who speaks to us in the Third Gospel; and if the words often seem to savour of Pauline doctrine, it is because St. Paul above all other men of his time assimilated that side of our Lord's teaching which this Gospel has specially preserved.'[1] The value of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is that it enforces this claim by carrying back the teaching peculiar to Lk. to a document written almost within the Apostle's lifetime.

But apart from any importance which the theology of Proto-Luke may have in the development of New Testament doctrine, its intrinsic merits mark out this document as a work of the highest importance for the historian and the theologian alike. Too long we have looked upon the teaching peculiar to the Third Gospel as if it stood upon a lower plane of authentication than that of Mk. and Q. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis destroys this assumption; it throws back into the earliest stages of Gospel tradition the picture of a Christ whose compassion blesses the outcasts of society, and whose last words to man are a message of hope to a dying thief.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 119.

INDEX

§ 1. NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Acts, The, 258, 266, 271.
Allen, W. C., 1, 99 n., 204.
Annas, 225, 226.

Bacon, B. W., 118, 224, 225, 228 n., 229 n., 238 n.
Bartlet, J. V., 12–18, 19 f., 90 n., 206, 207, 208, 210, 211 n., 213 n.
Bethsaida, 92.
Bousset, 119, 265.
Bruce, A. B., 232 n.
Burkitt, F. C., 4–8, 101, 117, 121, 176, 216 f., 218 n., 235 n., 241 n., 243 f., 253, 267 n.
Burney, C. F., 16 n., 203 ff.
Burton, E. de Witte, 20.

Cadbury, H. J., 197 n., 203 n., 210, 215.
Caesarea, 11, 15, 19, 25, 212, 213, 214.
Charles, R. H., 119, 120, 203, 204.
Charlesworth, C. E., 214 n.
Christology, 265 ff.
Chwolson, 228 n.
Colani, 118.

Dalman, G., 203.
Dante, 273.
Daughters of Philip, 19, 211 ff., 251 n.
Deissmann, 203, 204.
Didache, The, 38 n.

Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, The, 199, 203 n., 244, 265 f.
Emmet, C. W., 116.
Erbes, 119.
Eschatological Discourse, The, 27, 101 ff., 118 ff., 166.
Eusebius, 119.

Faith, 259.
Feine, P., 2, 3 f., 19, 26.
Forgiveness, 258 f.
Four Document Hypothesis, The, vi, 26 n.
Fourth Evangelist's knowledge of Lk., The, 224 ff.
Fourth Gospel, The, 28, 221 ff., 273. Appendix to, 229, 230.

Genealogy, The, 8, 76, 147, 194 f., 269 f.
Gould, F. C., 82 n.
Grace, 258 f.
'Great Omission', The, 85, 91, 138 ff., 189 f.
'Greater Interpolation', The, 10, 13, 151 f., 195, 209, 234 ff.

Harmonists, The, 197 n.
Harnack, 1, 28, 116, 123, 194, 199, 200 n., 203, 211 n., 215, 216, 222, 224.
Hawkins, Sir John C., 1, 10 ff., 26, 69 f., 72, 73, 76, 108, 138, 139 f., 161, 194, 198 n., 199, 203, 216.
Hibbert Journal, The, iii, 22, 25, 184.
Holdsworth, W. W., 138 n.
Howard, W. F., 203 n., 204 n.
Humphries, A. L., 269.

Irenaeus, 273 f.

Joanna, 211, 248.
John the Baptist, 146 f.
Joy, 259.

Kingdom of God, The, 255
Kyrios, 265 f.

Lagrange, 204 n.
Lake, K., 61 f., 64, 227, 228 n., 243 f., 266 n., 268.
Loisy, 138 n.
Luke, St., not a Paulinist, 239 f.
his art, 59, 248, 262, 264.

Maran, 265.
Mark,
ending, 67.
gaps in, 231.
historical value of, 234, 245 f., 254.
list of Markan passages in Lk., 129.
'Markan Omissions', 135 ff., 188 ff.
order in Lk., 195.
use of in Lk., 18, 126 ff., 184.
Martha and Mary, 225, 226.
Micklem, E. R., 46 n., 250 n.
Milligan, G., 116 n., 203.
Miracles, 88, 249 ff.
Moffatt, J., 1, 4, 118, 138 n., 139, 158, 188, 198 n., 203 n., 224, 228 n., 229 n., 238 n., 239 n.
Moulton, J. H., 116 n., 203.

Names and Titles, 265 f.

Oesterley, W. O. E., 120 n.
O.T. Prophecy, 266 ff.

Papias, 1, 17.
Parables, 256 f.
Parallel Versions, 215 n.
Parousia, The, 103, 114, 116, 122, 159, 256 f.
Paul, St., 273 f.
Perry, A. M., 20 ff., 117.
Philip the Evangelist, 15, 19, 211 f.
Place of the Resurrection Appearances, 242 ff.
Plummer, A., 66 n., 197 n., 198 n., 236 n., 249 n.
Portrait of Jesus in Proto-Luke, 260 ff.
graciousness, 261.
humanity, 263 f.
realism, 263.
sense of purpose, 262.
severity, 261 f.
Prayer, 259, 264.
Preface to Lk., The, 17 f., 166, 197 f., 210.
Proto-Luke,
authorship of, 24 f., 202 ff., 260, 272.
comparison with Mk. and Jn., 218 ff.
characteristic ideas of, 207.
date, &c., 25, 211 ff., 264.
historical value of, 25 f., 216 ff., 261 ff.
literary connexions in, 208 ff.; cf. 185 ff.
miracles of, 249.
narratives peculiar to, 246 ff.
principles of investigation, 29 ff.
purpose of, 272 f.
stories about women, 214, 248.
style of, 203 ff.
text of, 214 f.
theological value of, 273 f.
theology of, 255 ff.
unity of, 164 ff., 172 ff., 185 ff.

Q (also, Logian Document), 1, 5, 7, 8 f., 12, 16 f.
St. Luke's use of, 144 ff., 184 f.

Ramsay, W. M., 194, 216, 245 n.
Resurrection Body of Jesus, The, 67, 227 f.
Resurrection Narratives, The, 63 ff., 225, 252 f.

Samaritan Incidents, 211, 225.
Sanday, W., 18 ff., 70, 79 f., 92, 211 n., 228 n., 229 n., 238 n.
Schmidt, W., 204 n.
Schmiedel, 165, 194, 228, 229 n.
Semitisms, 16, 203 ff.
Sixfold Date of Lk. iii. 1 f., 164 f., 193 f.
Small Apocalypse Theory, The, 118, 120.
Smith, G. A., 92.
Soden, H. von, 138 n.
Sonship, 269 ff.
Spirit, The, 268 f.
Spitta, 118, 138 n.
Stanton, V. H., 3, 4, 7, 8 ff., 15, 19, 26, 138 n., 139 f., 162, 208, 209, 216, 224, 228 n., 229 n., 236 n., 238 n., 247 n.
Streeter, B. H., iii f., 1, 20, 22 ff., 44 n., 49, 76 f., 107, 118 n., 138 f., 160 n., 161, 184, 203 n., 211 n., 225, 272 n.
Suffering Servant, The, 267 f.
Swete, H. B., 82 n., 267 n., 274.

Teaching of Jesus in Proto-Luke, The, 255 ff.
Thackeray, H. St. J., 204 n.
Thompson, J. M., 138 n., 140 n.
Torrey, C. C., 20, 204.

Tübingen School, The, 216.
Two Document Theory, The, vi. f, 1, 12, 16, 23, 27.

Usener, 165, 194.

Virgin Birth, The, 195, 270.

Wealth, 257 f.
Weiss, B., 2, 3 f., 26, 118.
Weiss, J., 2, 3 f., 19, 26, 119.
Wellhausen, 119, 138 n., 204.
Wendling, 138 n.
Wernle, 138 n.
'We-Sections', 198 ff., 212.
Wesley, 158.
Westcott and Hort, 228 n.
Williams, N., 138 n.
Windisch, 198 n., 199, 203 n.
Wright, A., 138 n.

§ 2. NARRATIVES

Action of the Women, 60 ff.
Agony, The, 43 ff., 240 n., 251.
Anointing at Bethany, 192 f., 225, 233.
Appearances of Jesus, 66 f., 252 f.
Approach to Jerusalem, 76, 94 f., 142 f., 170 f.
Ascension, The, 67, 228.

Baptism of Jesus, 23, 77, 145, 147, 219.
Betrayal and Arrest, 45 ff., 215, 240.
Birth Stories, 8, 76, 164 ff., 271.
Burial Story, 27, 59 f., 68, 215, 242.

Call of Simon, 76, 166 f., 168, 192.
Centurion's Servant, 6, 150, 225.
Choice of the Apostles, 80, 81 f.. 83 n., 168 f.
Cleansing, The, 95 f., 97, 133, 171, 237 f.
Crucifixion, 27, 55 ff., 215, 241.
Cure of the Blind Beggar at Jericho, 92, 93 f., 133, 196 f.
Cure of the Dropsical Man, 155, 250.
Cursing of the Fig Tree, 96, 133.

Daughter of Herodias, 88, 131, 138.
Denial, The, 6, 48 f., 242.
Departure to Galilee, 76 n., 77, 148, 231.

Epileptic Lad, 16 n., 84, 90, 132, 215.

Feeding of the Five Thousand, 84, 87, 91 f.
Feet Washing, The, 225.

Healing of the High Priest's Servant's Ear, 45 f., 186 f., 240. 250 n.
Herod's Curiosity, 84, 87 f., 131.

Journey to Emmaus, 66, 214 n., 252.

Many Miracles of Healing, 80 f., 83.
Miraculous Darkness, 30, 58, 186, 241 f.
Miraculous Draught of Fishes, 229, 232 f.
Mocking, The, 6, 49 f., 240 f.

Obtaining of the Colt, 94, 97, 133, 143, 161, 237.

Penitent Thief, 241, 274.
Peter by the Lake, 166 f.
Peter's Confession, 84, 88, 131, 187.
Preaching of John, 23, 76 f., 145, 162.
Preparations for the Passover, 34 f., 175, 179 f.
Priests' Plot (xix. 47 f.), 95, 96 ff., 171 f., 237 n.; (xxii. 1–2), 3, 34 f.

Raising of the Widow's Son, 150, 250 f.
Rejection at Nazareth, 24, 142, 192.
Rending, The, 30 n., 58, 186, 241 f.
Request of James and John, 92, 192.
Retirement to a Desert Place, 78 f.

Second Prediction of the Passion, 16 n., 84, 90 f., 132.
Sermon at Nazareth, 76, 142, 148, 191, 195, 247.

Seventy, The, 11, 13, 15, 153, 235, 249, 263.
Simon of Cyrene and the Journey to the Cross, 54 f.
Supper, The, 7, 27, 35 ff., 179, 215, 227, 228 f., 238 ff.

Temptation, The, 23, 77, 145, 147 f., 270.
Ten Lepers, 158, 259.
Third Prediction of the Passion, 3, 92 f.
Transfiguration, The, 16 n.. 84, 89, 132, 215.
Treachery of Judas, 3, 34 f.
Trial before Herod, 7, 53 f., 241.
Trial before Pilate, 7, 52 f., 241.
Trial before the Priests, 6, 50 f., 240 f.
Triumphal Entry, 96, 98, 236 f.

Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus, 84, 85, 86 f., 130, 195.
Visit of the Women to the Tomb, 62, 63 ff., 242 f.
Visit to the Village of Martha and Mary, 152, 153.

Weeping over Jerusalem, 76, 98, 170 f.
Widow's Mites, 98, 100.
Woman in the City, 142, 151, 192, 233 f., 247 f., 259.
Woman who cried, 'Blessed is the womb', 154.
Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity, 155, 250.

Zacchaeus, 76, 93, 94, 133, 159 f., 161, 170.

§ 3. SAYINGS, PARABLES, AND DISCOURSES

Beelzebub Controversy, 24, 85, 141, 190.
Blasphemy, 85, 190.

Change of Methods, 43.
Charge to the Seventy, 87.
Charge to the Twelve, 83 n., 84, 87, 131.
Coming of the Son of Man, 154, 158.
Counting the Cost, 156.

Discipleship, 84, 88, 156, 262.
Dispute as to the Greatest, 84, 89, 192.
Dividing the Inheritance, 154.
Divorce, 24, 157, 190.
Door Shut, The, 155.

Faith, 157.
Fall of Jerusalem, 109 ff.
Farmer and his Man, 157 f.
Fasting, 80 f.
Fate of the Temple, 102 ff.
Fig Tree, 155.
Forgiveness, 157.
Friend at Midnight, 154.

Good Samaritan, 153, 191, 208.
Great Commandment, 14, 24, 98, 141, 191, 208.
Great Sermon, The, 149 f., 168.
Great Supper, 155.

Hating Kinsfolk, 156.

Leaven, 256.
Lord's Prayer, 154.
Lost Coin, 156.
Lost Sheep, 156.
Lost Son, 156.

Mustard Seed, 24, 85, 141, 256.

'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem', 155.
Offences, 157, 190.

Pharisee and the Publican, 158, 170.
Pounds, 23, 76, 133, 155, 159 f., 161, 256.
Prediction of the Betrayal, 40 f.
Prediction of the Denial, 42 f.

Question about the Resurrection, 16 n., 98, 99 f.

Rash King, 156.
Rich Fool, 154, 257.
Rich Man and Lazarus, 157, 257.
Ripening Fig Tree, 112, 122.
Rulers of the Gentiles, 24, 41 f.

Sayings about Salt, 24, 156, 190, 262.
Seed growing secretly, 85, 138.
Serving Two Masters, 156.
Sower, The, 84, 86.
Strait Gate, 155.

Talents, 23, 159.
'Thrones', 5, 160.
Tower Builder, 156.

Unjust Judge, 158.
Unjust Steward, 156, 257.

Vineyard, 98 f.

Warnings as regards Persecution, 104 ff.
Woes on the Pharisees and Lawyers, 154.

5243

7946G

DATE DUE

2
T
BS 2595 .T3 1926
Taylor, Vincent, 1887-
Behind the Third gospel :

UNITED THEOLOGICAL

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2595.T3 1926
Taylor, Vince Behind the Third gospel :
3 0645 0005 4188 4